

compelled to pay for quarters, subsistence, and laundry on salaries as low as \$1,020 annually and expressing support of House bills 3529 and 3829, which would abolish these charges; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

2924. Also, petition of Local No. 149, International Association of Machinists, San Leandro, Calif., urging support of House bill 4862; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2925. Also, petition of Lodge No. 670, International Association of Machinists, Muskegon, Mich., urging support of House bill 4862; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2926. Also, petition of Jacob House & Sons, Buffalo, N. Y., urging support of House bill 5630; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2927. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of Local No. 90, of the United Federal Workers of America, and employees of the Veterans' Administration, Bronx, N. Y., favoring House bills 3529 and 3829; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

2928. Also, petition of Forty Plus Club of New York, concerning House bill 118 and Senate bill 890; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2929. Also, petition of the Senate, Legislature of the State of New York, requesting Congress to amend the postal laws to provide that henceforth the rates proclaimed shall apply to books in the same manner as those rates with reference to newspapers and magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2930. Also, memorial of the Senate, Legislature of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of the Wagner-Rogers bill; to the Committee on Labor.

2931. Also, petition of the Assembly, Legislature of the State of New York, concerning the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2932. By Mr. McCORMACK: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging the Postmaster General of the United States to provide for a special commemorative postage stamp to be issued in honor of Capt. Jeremiah O'Brien; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2933. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging Congress to enact legislation increasing the amounts of old-age assistance payable by the Federal Government to States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2934. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Assembly of the State of New York memorializing Congress to pass sufficient legislation whereby the States, including the State of New York, may avail themselves of their failure to take full advantage of the credit provisions of the Social Security Act for the years 1936 or 1937 and that said legislation provide that out of the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay such amounts through the Division of Disbursements of the Treasury Department to each State unemployment fund and particularly to the unemployment administration fund of the State of New York; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2935. By Mr. PFELFER: Petition of Local No. 90, United Federal Workers of America, Bronx, N. Y., urging support of House bills 3529 and 3829; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

2936. Also, petition of the Young Women's Christian Association, Charlotte, N. C., favoring the Nye-Bone-Clark bill and also the Thomas amendment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2937. Also, petition of the Committee for Amendment of the Coal Act, Washington, D. C., urging favorable consideration of House bill 5119; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2938. By Mr. SECCOMBE: Petition of Nettie K. Hurlburt and approximately 50 residents of North Canton, Ohio, urging the United States to put into effect a policy of non-participation in aggression by stopping the shipment to aggressor nations of all goods that can be used by their

military forces, and that immediate steps be taken to stop their shipment to Japan; also urging that any measures possible for the peace-loving people be taken to aid China in her desperate resistance against the invaders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2939. Also, resolution, adopted by Local No. 150, International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers, of Rittman, Ohio, urging the curtailment of foreign importation of paper products; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2940. Also, petition of Rev. L. S. Hegnauer, pastor, Lowell Reformed Church, of Canton, Ohio, and members of his Sunday school class, urging Congress to give the people the opportunity to vote on whether or not we are to be plunged into another foreign war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2941. Also, petition of Metta E. Musgrave and approximately 75 other residents of North Canton, Ohio, urging the United States to put into effect a policy of nonparticipation in aggression by stopping the shipment to aggressor nations of all goods that can be used by their military forces, and that immediate steps be taken to stop their shipment to Japan; also urging that any measures possible for the peace-loving people be taken to aid China in her desperate resistance against the invaders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2942. Also, petition of sundry residents of Alliance, Ohio, urging the passage of the Townsend recovery plan, known as House bill 2; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2943. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Letter from Herbert Weir, county adjutant, the American Legion of Bergen County, N. J., advising that the regular meeting of the Bergen County committee, the American Legion, held at Ridgefield, N. J., April 25, the 240 delegates present, representing 4,000 members in Bergen County, went on record as unanimously opposing the war referendum legislation now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 8, 1939

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, infinite in power, who givest might to those who earnestly desire and wistfully pursue the higher, nobler things: Regard, we beseech Thee, our prayer and supplication as we lift up our voice unto Thee confessing our weakness and our sin and invoking Thy blessing upon us. We are conscious of a dull, craven fear among the nations of the world that poisons life at its very springs, causing it to crawl when it should soar; cast out this fear, dear Lord, by Thy perfect love, removing all cowardly motives that pollute life's sanctuary, and grant that sincerity and singleness of purpose may there abide. Help us to realize that what we do will always be determined by what we are; restore to us, therefore, the power of conscience and clarify our vision; enable us always to respond to those divine promptings and inspirations which aim at the renewal and ultimate transformation of our poor lives, that with clean hands and pure hearts we may ascend into the hill of the Lord and receive the blessing of the generation of them that seek Thy face. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 4, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Danaher	Johnson, Calif.	Reed
Andrews	Davis	King	Reynolds
Ashurst	Donahay	La Follette	Russell
Austin	Downey	Lee	Schwartz
Bailey	Ellender	Logan	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	Frazier	Lucas	Sheppard
Barbour	George	Lundeen	Shipstead
Barkley	Gibson	McCarran	Slattery
Bilbo	Gillette	McKellar	Smathers
Bone	Glass	McNary	Stewart
Borah	Green	Maloney	Taft
Bridges	Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Bulow	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Burke	Hale	Minton	Townsend
Byrd	Harrison	Murray	Truman
Byrnes	Hatch	Norris	Tydings
Capper	Hayden	Nye	Vandenberg
Caraway	Herring	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Chavez	Hill	Overton	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	Holman	Pepper	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Holt	Pittman	
Connally	Hughes	Radcliffe	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] is detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are detained on important public business.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### VISIT TO THE SENATE OF THE PRESIDENT OF NICARAGUA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to make a statement to the Senate. Some days ago the State Department, through Secretary Hull, advised the Vice President that the President of Nicaragua is in this country and would be glad to visit the Chamber of the Senate, and suggested that, if agreeable to the Senate, today might be an appropriate opportunity.

The Chair understands that arrangements have been made for the President of Nicaragua to visit the Chamber, if agreeable to the Senate, at 12:15 o'clock. The Chair makes that statement for the information of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 12:15 o'clock p. m. the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, and that the Chair appoint a committee of three Senators to wait upon and receive the President of Nicaragua and escort him into the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] as the committee to receive and escort the President of Nicaragua into the Senate Chamber.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE DURING ADJOURNMENT—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under authority of the order of the 4th instant,

The following message was received by the Secretary from the House of Representatives on May 5, 1939: That the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 70. An act to amend section 90 of the Judicial Code, as amended, with respect to the terms of the Federal District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi;

S. 270. An act for the relief of Lofts & Son; and

S. 1038. An act for the relief of L. M. Bell and M. M. Bell.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 111) designating August 19 of each year as National Aviation Day.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 3230. An act to amend the statutes providing punishment for transmitting threatening communications; and

H. R. 3812. An act granting postal employees credit for Saturday in annual and sick-leave law, thereby conforming to the 40-hour workweek or 5-day-week law.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5762) to provide for temporary postponement of the operations of certain provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. LEA, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. MAPES were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4997. An act giving the consent and approval of Congress to the Rio Grande compact signed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., on March 18, 1938; and

H. R. 5643. An act to invest the circuit courts of appeals of the United States with original and exclusive jurisdiction to review the order of detention of any alien ordered deported from the United States whose deportation or departure from the United States otherwise is not effectuated within 90 days after the date the warrant of deportation shall have become final; to authorize such detention orders in certain cases; to provide places for such detention; and for other purposes.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 752. An act to amend section 78 of the Judicial Code, relating to the district of Idaho;

H. R. 1694. An act for the relief of Bozzani Motors, Ltd.;

H. R. 2529. An act for the relief of W. F. Towson;

H. R. 3230. An act to amend the statutes providing punishment for transmitting threatening communications;

H. R. 3231. An act to authorize the mailing of pistols, revolvers, and other firearms capable of being concealed on the person, to officers of the Coast Guard;

H. R. 3587. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to exchange obsolete, unsuitable, and unserviceable machines and tools pertaining to the manufacture or repair of ordnance matériel for new machines and tools;

H. R. 3811. An act to provide for the appraisal of the pneumatic-mail-tube systems in New York and Boston;

H. R. 3812. An act granting postal employees credit for Saturday in annual and sick leave law, thereby conforming to the 40-hour workweek or 5-day-week law;

H. R. 4087. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended by the act of June 4, 1920, so as to confer on the commanding general, General Headquarters Air Force, the same retirement privileges now enjoyed by chiefs of branches;

H. R. 4771. An act limiting working hours of pneumatic-tube-system employees to 8 in 10 hours a day;

H. R. 4772. An act to provide time credits for substitutes in the pneumatic-tube service;

H. R. 4785. An act to provide a differential in pay for night work to pneumatic-tube-system employees in the Postal Service;

H. R. 4786. An act to extend the provisions of the 40-hour law to pneumatic-tube-system employees in the Postal Service;

H. R. 4852. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 241. Joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the celebration of the one hun-



dred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Lighthouse Service.

#### RELIEF OF DISBURSING OFFICERS IN THE NAVY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to the relief from responsibility of certain disbursing officers of the Navy on account of losses sustained, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### MINERAL LANDS, WAR OR NAVY DEPARTMENTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the leasing, development, and production under the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), as amended, of deposits of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, or gas in lands owned by the United States under the jurisdiction of the War or Navy Departments, and for other purposes, which with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

#### REGULATION OF TRAFFIC IN FOOD, DRUGS, AND COSMETICS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5762) to provide for temporary postponement of the operations of certain provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BAILEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. CLARK of Missouri, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. McNARY conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the Senate of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of the so-called Wagner-Rogers bill, to permit entrance into this country in the next 2 years of 20,000 children from families in Germany, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

(See resolution printed in full when presented today by Mr. WAGNER.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of New York stating that the postage rates on books proclaimed by the President on October 31, 1938, are in the public interest and should be perpetuated, and also that Congress should immediately amend the postal laws so as to provide that henceforth the rates proclaimed shall apply to books in the same manner as the rates with reference to newspaper and magazines, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

(See resolution printed in full when presented today by Mr. WAGNER.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide that certain States may avail themselves of their failure to take full advantage of the credit provisions of the Social Security Act for the years 1936 or 1937, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(See resolution printed in full when presented today by Mr. WAGNER.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the petition of Acme Local, No. 1136, of Hettinger County, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation appropriating \$250,000,000 for parity benefit payments to farmers, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a memorial from the International Conference for the Investigation of Vivisection, remonstrating against additional ap-

propriations for the New York World's Fair, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution of the City Council of Chicago, Ill., favoring reduction in the interest rate and an extension of the period of amortization of all home owners' loans, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also laid before the Senate petitions of the United Federal Workers of America, Local No. 2, of Washington, D. C., and Local No. 47, of New York City, N. Y., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1314, providing for appeals procedure in the Federal Civil Service, which were referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions of the West Virginia Osteopathic Society and the Delaware State Osteopathic Society, favoring amendment of the so-called Wagner National Health bill (S. 1620), so as to preserve the freedom of choice of the physician and school of practice to persons entitled to medical care, and providing osteopathic representation on Federal and State advisory councils, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate petitions of sundry citizens of Beaver Dam, Wis., praying for the adoption of the so-called Townsend national recovery plan, providing old-age assistance, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution of the Ninth District Petroleum Industries Committee of Alabama favoring the expiration as of June 30, 1939, of the 4-cent per gallon Federal lubricating oil tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a letter from the president of the Sentinels of the Republic, Washington, D. C., transmitting a statement of the purposes and program of policies of the organization as recently approved by its executive committee, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to have noted in the RECORD that I have received 77 petitions signed by about 2,000 citizens favoring the adoption of a resolution now pending, having for its purpose the prevention of traffic in war materials for use against the Chinese people. I ask that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be received and referred as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WALSH presented a resolution adopted by the Polish American Citizens Club, at a meeting held at Indian Orchard, Mass., favoring the policies pursued by the United States Government regarding European affairs, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution of the Grand Council of the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts, Order of Sons of Italy in America, Boston, Mass., favoring the adoption by Congress of a joint resolution expressing a spirit of friendship toward all nations and manifesting the desire of the United States to cooperate impartially toward a lasting world peace, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TYDINGS presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of pending legislation to admit 10,000 refugee children into the United States per year during a 2-year period, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also (for himself and Mr. RADCLIFFE) presented a memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, remonstrating against the enactment of House bill 3325, relative to the perpetuation of the stabilization fund and empowering the President to further alter the gold content of the dollar, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also (for himself and Mr. RADCLIFFE) presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of neutrality legislation which will give the United States complete protection from any and all embroilment in war and protect lives and properties from the danger

of war, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also (for himself and Mr. RADCLIFFE) presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a merchant ensign to be used on all merchantmen, and also that merchantmen be forbidden by law to fly the naval ensign, Old Glory, which flag it is proposed to be used exclusively on naval vessels, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. WAGNER presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of New York, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Whereas, in accordance with the power vested in him by law, the President of the United States on October 31, 1938, proclaimed that the postage rates on books as defined shall for the period commencing November 1, 1938, and ending June 30, 1939, be 1½ cents a pound or a fraction thereof irrespective of the zone of destination; and

Whereas the interests of the public in the promotion of the culture growth, education, and development of the American people required the change proclaimed; and

Whereas by the proclamation the discrimination in postage rates against books and in favor of magazines and newspapers which had theretofore existed was brought to an end and the same rates made applicable to books as to other reading matters; and

Whereas it is vital for this Nation to encourage the widest possible dissemination of the written word and the most free possible market in ideas; and

Whereas while the present postage rates applicable to newspapers and magazines have been permanently enacted into law by the Congress the same postage rates will not be applicable to books after June 30, 1939, unless similarly enacted into law, or unless the power to proclaim these rates is reconfirmed on the President of the United States and he chooses to exercise it; and

Whereas the matter is of sufficient vital import to warrant congressional action: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved (if the assembly concur),* That it is the sense of the Legislature of the State of New York that the postage rates on books proclaimed by the President of the United States on October 31, 1938, are in the public interest and should be perpetuated; and be it further

*Resolved (if the assembly concur),* That Congress should at once amend the postal laws by legislative act to provide that henceforth the rates proclaimed shall apply to books in the same manner as it has legislated those rates with reference to newspapers and magazines; and be it further

*Resolved (if the assembly concur),* That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress and each United States Senator from the State of New York.

Mr. WAGNER also presented the following resolution of the Senate of the State of New York, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration:

Whereas the Wagner-Rogers bill introduced in the Congress of the United States will allow 20,000 children from persecuted families in Germany to enter this country in the next 2 years; and

Whereas aid given to the helpless child victims of Germany's ruthless persecution will be in keeping with the generous impulses and democratic instincts of the American people; and

Whereas 20,000 children may thus be spared the appalling prospect of lives without hope; and

Whereas these children, whose maximum age will be 14 years, will in no way increase the unemployment burden in this country, and their support will be guaranteed by responsible families here; and

Whereas the bill is sponsored by United States Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, of New York State, and has received the support of former President Herbert Hoover and many labor and industrial leaders: Now, therefore, be it:

*Resolved,* That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully memorialized to enact into law with all convenient speed the Wagner-Rogers bill to allow for the entrance into this country in the next 2 years of 20,000 children from persecuted families in Germany; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the clerk of the senate is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from New York State.

Mr. WAGNER also presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of New York, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Whereas, under article 18 of the Labor Law of the State of New York, as enacted, there was created an unemployment insurance fund; and

Whereas under section 520 of said article 18 there is established an unemployment administration fund, to which fund all Federal moneys allotted or apportioned to the State by the Federal Social Security Board or other agency shall be paid; and

Whereas certain States, including the State of New York, have failed to take full advantage of the credit provisions of the Social Security Act of the Federal Government; and

Whereas there is a need on the part of the Congress for the passage of legislation to make available certain sums to the States, including the State of New York, which failed in 1936 or 1937 to take full advantage of the credit provisions of the Social Security Act: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved (if the senate concur),* The Congress of the United States be and it respectfully is hereby memorialized to pass sufficient legislation whereby the States, including the State of New York, may avail themselves of their failure to take full advantage of the credit provisions of the Social Security Act for the years 1936 or 1937 and that said legislation provide that out of the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay such amount through the Division of Disbursements of the Treasury Department to each such State unemployment fund and particularly to the unemployment administration fund of the State of New York; and be it further

*Resolved (if the senate concur),* That a copy of this resolution immediately be transmitted to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, and to each Member of Congress and each United States Senator elected from the State of New York.

#### PAY-ROLL TAXES, SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—PETITIONS

Mr. VANDENBERG. I present petitions signed by 2,500 so-called small businessmen of Michigan for relief from social-security taxes—relief, by the way, which is belatedly in sight. I ask that the text of one of the petitions be printed in the RECORD, that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Finance, and that the covering letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on Finance and the text of one of the petitions and the covering letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### Greetings to the Congress of the United States:

The undersigned small-business men, their employees and customers conjointly with the Michigan Division of the National Small Business Men's Association respectfully request that the Social Security Act be amended so as to maintain pay-roll deductions for old-age benefits at present level, experience having shown that the tremendously large reserves originally provided by the act are unnecessary.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS MEN'S ASSOCIATION,  
MICHIGAN DIVISION,  
Detroit, May 3, 1939.

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Michigan Division of the National Small Business Men's Association recently conducted a survey to determine the effects of the Social Security Act on business. The results of that survey very clearly indicate that the total tax load has become a severe handicap to business and recovery—more than that, it seriously threatens the very existence of many Michigan concerns. Our survey (an analysis of which we will be pleased to place at your disposal) discloses the following:

(1) Added to other existing taxes, the social-security tax is detrimental to business, responsible for net losses thus preventing purchases for replacement equipment and causing tax payments to be paid out of reserves which means eventual if not immediate bankruptcy.

(2) Competitive conditions prevent organizations from raising prices sufficiently to cover the tax.

(3) The increases in gross sales necessary to offset this tax are far beyond reasonable expectancy. Sales increases required from firms reporting in percentage figures vary from 5 to 60 percent with the average slightly in excess of 24 percent. Firms reporting in dollars and cents vary from \$10,000 to \$300,000 annually with the majority in excess of \$150,000 per year.

(4) Eighty-five percent of the organizations reporting showed losses for the year 1938. The social security tax represented an average of 24 percent of their losses.

(5) The social security tax reduces employment. Organizations turn down temporary business rather than permit their tax reserves to suffer by employing temporary help. Dwindling reserves and net losses prevent capital expenditure for business expansion or replacement thus reducing the possibility of employment in many industries.

In view of the fact that the social-security tax alone has such a demoralizing effect upon business and employment, the need for a general tax revision must be apparent to the Members of Congress.

We contend that a step in the right direction will be an amendment to the Social Security Act to retain pay-roll deductions at their present level. In support of that contention we recently circulated a limited number of petitions in a few Michigan cities. It was not our intention in so doing to obtain a great quantity of names but rather to secure a cross section of the attitude of



Michigan citizens on the question. We enclose herewith 2,717 signatures of farmers, housewives, laborers, office workers, and executives signed to that petition, which reads:

"The undersigned small-business men, their employees, and customers conjointly with the Michigan division of the National Small-Business Men's Association, respectfully request that the Social Security Act be amended so as to maintain pay-roll deductions for old-age benefits at present level, experience having shown that the tremendously large reserves originally provided by the act are unnecessary."

We respectfully ask you to present these petitions for us to the Congress of the United States and to express to the Members of the Senate that it is the sincere and considered opinion of the members of this association that business confidence, essential to recovery, will come only after a trend toward economy is definitely apparent. Mere words or promises of future consideration are wholly inadequate. Only definite action in the form of constructive tax-relief measures will effectively meet today's needs. Further delay will jeopardize the very existence of business establishments in the State of Michigan and result in more widespread and increased unemployment.

Yours very truly,

FRANCIS C. SPENCE,  
*Executive Secretary.*

#### NEUTRALITY—PETITION

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, among the many resolutions and petitions which have reached me concerning our neutrality situation is one from the Bridgeport, Conn., Council of Catholic Women, with a membership of more than 7,000. I ask that the text of the petition be printed in the RECORD and that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the text of the petition or resolution will be printed in the RECORD, and it will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Whereas we Americans love peace and abominate war, because we know that the heavy burden of war rests on the shoulders of our youth and that the rulers and the legislators whose votes plunge us into war, as well as the war mongers and unscrupulous profiteers, are not the ones who engage in battle and suffer bodily harm and even death itself;

Whereas in the recent war America fought to make the world safe for imperialistic democracy and gained nothing, but lost untold numbers of young men in the slaughter besides the two billions in material wealth;

Whereas those same so-called democracies that added to their empires and yet refused to pay their just debts to America, thus placing an insupportable burden upon the backs of American taxpayers, are once more working subtly through propaganda to embroil us in another and more terrible war;

Whereas one of the countries, namely Russia, that we are now asked to join with, is bolshevistic and atheistic and is just waiting to destroy our Constitution and all we hold dear;

Whereas, our entrance into such a war is wholly unnecessary, unjust, and anti-American and would cause the blood of our youth to be shed once more in profusion, and for what? Simply to preserve inviolate the imperialistic designs of so-called democracies: Be it

*Resolved*, That we, the Bridgeport Council of Catholic Women, with a membership of 7,000 in Bridgeport, Fairfield, Stratford, and Trumbull, in mass meeting assembled on this 17th day of April 1939 absolutely condemn war and its propaganda and are determined that Congress shall not relinquish its constitutional rights by placing in the hands of any one man the stupendous power of naming aggressors in any conflict not our own and thus embroiling this country in war; be it

*Resolved*, That as citizens of these United States we courageously come to the defense of American youth and in its behalf call upon all fellow citizens in city, State, and country to militantly protest against all entangling foreign alliances and to urge our Representatives in Congress, first, to vote for a Neutrality Act that is genuinely neutral and fair to all nations alike and, second, to punish propagandists and to warn responsible representatives of our Government to be temperate in speech and to shun all provocative and inflammatory language and acts; be it further

*Resolved*, That we urge our United States Senators and others to prove themselves true Americans worthy of the sacred trust given them by the people, to work for America and not for any foreign country, to vote to keep this country free from war and thus protect our homes and preserve the lifeblood of our youth.

MRS. JOHN L. KENNELLY,  
*Chairman of Council.*  
MABEL A. LAVEY,  
*Chairman of Legislation.*

BRIDGEPORT, CONN., April 17, 1939.

#### REPORT OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. BAILEY submitted the following report, which was ordered to be printed in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 28, 1939.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

To the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

GENTLEMEN: As provided in section 7 of the act approved April 16, 1937, authorizing the establishment of a permanent instruction staff at the United States Coast Guard Academy, the annual Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy was appointed in January of this year consisting of the following:

Senators: Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY, of North Carolina, chairman, Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, ex officio member; Hon. FRANCIS T. MALONEY, of Connecticut; Hon. WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr., of Maine.

Members of the House of Representatives: Hon. SCHUYLER O. BLAND, of Virginia, chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, ex officio member; Hon. LINDSAY C. WARREN, of North Carolina; Hon. EDWARD J. HART, of New Jersey; Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH, of California.

In further conformity to the above-mentioned act, the Secretary of the Treasury, under date of March 14, 1939, designated 9 a. m., Thursday, April 20, 1939, as the time for the meeting of the Board of Visitors at the Coast Guard Academy, New London, Conn. Senators JOSIAH W. BAILEY and WALLACE H. WHITE, accompanied by Representatives EDWARD J. HART and RICHARD J. WELCH, left Washington at 10 a. m., April 19, arriving at New London, Conn., at about 5 p. m., the same date, when they were met by the Superintendent of the academy and conducted to his quarters on the reservation. The departure of Representative S. O. BLAND was delayed until 1 p. m., on account of a meeting of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and Senator MALONEY was unable to leave Washington before 5 p. m. Members of the Board arriving at 5 were entertained at dinner by the Superintendent and Mrs. Jones in their quarters. Later the party was joined by Representative BLAND, and motion pictures depicting various phases of Coast Guard life were shown the members of the Board.

The Board convened the following morning at 9 a. m., and was later joined by Senator MALONEY. The first business upon the assembling of the Board was the election of a chairman, and Representative S. O. BLAND, the nominee of Senator J. W. BAILEY, was so elected. The Board expressed the desire that Commander (E) E. Reed-Hill, United States Coast Guard, act as secretary, a position filled by this officer during the meeting of the preceding board in 1938.

Admiral R. R. Waesche, Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, and Capt. E. D. Jones, superintendent of the academy, were invited to appear before the Board and to bring to the attention of same any pertinent and necessary matters. There was a general discussion of various matters affecting the academy, with the exception of the curriculum, which the Board ascertained was satisfactorily taken care of by the advisory committee of the Coast Guard Academy, which, appointed by law, makes recommendations in such matters to the Secretary of the Treasury. The Board discussed and inquired into the following matters:

- (1) Set-up of appropriations for the academy.
- (2) The loss of the two schooners (Gloucester fishing type), one sunk and the other damaged beyond economic repair by the hurricane of September 1938.
- (3) Use of facilities at the academy by the United States Maritime Service in the Coast Guard training of licensed and unlicensed personnel of the merchant marine.
- (4) The geographical distribution of cadets accepted by the service.
- (5) The number of enlisted men admitted for cadetship.
- (6) The method of obtaining cadets by open competitive examinations held throughout the United States.
- (7) The effect of special preparation for competitive examinations by so-called cram schools.
- (8) The pay and allowances of cadets.
- (9) The handling of cadet funds and cadet messes.
- (10) Need for publicity in obtaining cadet material.
- (11) The proper date for the meeting of the Board of Visitors, probably a few weeks later in the year.
- (12) The enactment of legislation authorizing an appropriation for contingencies for the superintendent of the academy, which was recommended by the previous Board of Visitors and which was approved on this date.

The Board inspected the academy grounds and reviewed the battalion of cadets, after which the members had luncheon with the cadets.

The Board was most favorably impressed with the academy and the administration thereof, and finds it a thoroughly modern educational institution of high standards. The Board believes that comparatively few young men are familiar with the advantages of a cadetship in the Coast Guard, and the Board is of the opinion that every reasonable effort should be made to present to the qualified throughout the country the opportunity offered at the Coast Guard Academy for an education and a career.

The Board recommends an appropriation of not to exceed \$200,000 for the construction of a suitable vessel for the training of cadets in the handling of sails—this vessel to be a replacement of the two schooners no longer available due to damage sustained by the hurricane—as the proper training of cadets is being seriously handicapped by the lack of a suitable sailing vessel; that additional funds be made available for replacements, supplies, and repairs to laboratory equipment; and that the act of April 16, 1937, be so

amended that when a member appointed in January is unable to attend the annual meeting an additional member may be appointed in his stead.

The Board desires to make mention of the cordial reception and hospitable treatment furnished its members by Captain Jones, the other officers, and cadets at the academy.

Having completed its inspection, the Board departed New London at 2:19 and arrived in Washington at 9:20 that night.

Respectfully submitted.

SCHUYLER O. BLAND, *Chairman*.  
JOSIAH W. BAILEY.  
FRANCIS T. MALONEY.  
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.  
EDWARD J. HART.  
RICHARD J. WELCH.

ELLIS REED-HILL,  
*Secretary to the Board.*

#### REPORT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE DURING ADJOURNMENT—APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT

Under authority of the order of the 4th instant,

On May 5, 1939, Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5269) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 386) thereon.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 860) authorizing the President to present a medal of honor to Harold R. Wood, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 387) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

S. 1116. A bill to amend section 1860 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (48 U. S. C. 1460), to permit retired officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps to hold civil office in any Territory of the United States (Rept. No. 388);

S. 1854. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 389);

H. R. 2878. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 390); and

H. R. 5765. A bill to authorize commissioning aviation cadets in the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves upon completion of training, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 391).

Mr. WALSH also, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1118) to provide for acceptance and cashing of Government pay checks of retired naval personnel and members of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves by commissary stores and ship's stores ashore, located outside the continental limits of the United States, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 392) thereon.

Mr. AUSTIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3131) to authorize the Secretary of War to convey certain lands owned by the United States for other lands needed in connection with the expansion of West Point Military Reservation, N. Y., and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 393) thereon.

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 839. A bill to amend the Retirement Act of April 23, 1904 (Rept. No. 394);

S. 871. A bill for the relief of James T. Moore (Rept. No. 395);

S. 912. A bill for the relief of Joseph Kenney (Rept. No. 396); and

S. 1181. A bill to provide for the status of warrant officers and of enlisted men of the Regular Army who serve as commissioned officers (Rept. No. 397).

Mr. SHEPPARD also, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported

them each with an amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 1820. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain land owned by the United States to the State of Texas; and certain other land to the county of Galveston, Tex. (Rept. No. 398); and

S. 1666. A bill to provide a right-of-way (Rept. No. 399).

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4131) for the relief of Melvin Gerard Alvey, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 400) thereon.

Mr. GILLETTE (for himself and Mr. CAPPER), from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 446) to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 401) thereon.

#### SACRAMENTO GOLDEN EMPIRE CENTENNIAL

Mr. JOHNSON of California. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I report back favorably, without amendment, a joint resolution authorizing the President to invite other nations to participate in the Sacramento Golden Empire Centennial commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of Sacramento by Capt. John A. Sutter. It requests no money from the Government, and I ask for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 221) authorizing the President to invite other nations to participate in the Sacramento Golden Empire Centennial commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of Sacramento by Capt. John A. Sutter was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the President of the United States is authorized to invite by proclamation, or in such manner as he may deem proper, foreign nations to participate in the Sacramento Golden Empire Centennial to be held at Sacramento, Calif., from May 1, 1939, to September 10, 1939, inclusive, for the purpose of properly commemorating and observing the one hundredth anniversary of the arrival in California at the confluence of the American and Sacramento Rivers, of John Augustus Sutter, a Swiss adventurer, and the founding by him, through the establishment of Sutter's Fort, of what is today California's capital city of Sacramento, which establishment and the subsequent development of the region adjacent resulted in the discovery of gold at Coloma, Calif.

SEC. 2. The Government of the United States is not by this resolution obligated to any expense in connection with the holding of such exposition.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

On May 5, 1939:

S. 513. An act to provide for the promotion on the retired list of the Navy of Fred G. Leith.

On May 6, 1939:

S. 70. An act to amend section 90 of the Judicial Code, as amended, with respect to the terms of the Federal District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi;

S. 270. An act for the relief of Lofts & Son; and

S. 1038. An act for the relief of L. M. Bell and M. M. Bell.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 2337. A bill to clarify the status of personnel of the Lighthouse Service serving under the jurisdiction of the War or Navy Department during national emergency; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 2338. A bill for the relief of Kenneth A. Cranmer; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2339. A bill for the relief of William H. Chambliss; and

S. 2340. A bill for the relief of George W. Stout; to the Committee on Claims.



By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 2341. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, approved August 14, 1935, and the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the definition "employee"; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 2342 (by request). A bill for the relief of Siegfried Stein, Erna Stein, and Marion Stein; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 2343. A bill to provide for the insurance of loans to business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2344. A bill providing for compensation to firemen injured while answering a call on property owned by the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2345. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Lamborn & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2346. A bill for the relief of Beryl M. McHam; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2347. A bill for the relief of Thomas W. Waldon (with accompanying papers); and

S. 2348. A bill relating to allowances to certain naval officers stationed in the Canal Zone for rental of quarters; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. 2349. A bill granting a pension to Caroline Cutler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

S. 2350. A bill to amend the act of Congress approved May 3, 1935, entitled "An act to promote safety on the public highways of the District of Columbia by providing for the financial responsibility of owners and operators of motor vehicles for damages caused by motor vehicles on the public highways in the District of Columbia; to prescribe penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act, and for other purposes;" to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2351 (by request). A bill providing for the incorporation of certain persons as Group Hospitalization, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 2352. A bill to amend Public, No. 190, June 23, 1932, to provide for the incorporation of credit unions within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

S. 2353. A bill to authorize appropriation for the construction of a Medical School Building at Carlisle Barracks, Pa.; and

S. 2354. A bill to provide for the rank and title of lieutenant general of the Regular Army for commanders of corps areas and foreign departments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 2355. A bill for the relief of Benno von Mayrhauser and Oskar von Mayrhauser; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. MINTON (for himself and Mr. VAN NUYS):

S. 2356. A bill to provide for the creation of the George Rogers Clark National Memorial, in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2357. A bill to provide for the coinage of fractional minor coins; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2358. A bill providing for the payment of an annuity to J. M. Logan from funds available for financing the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 2359. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of C. A. Blume against the United States; and

S. 2360. A bill to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, to John F. Considine, a former employee of the United States under the Reclamation Service, Department of the Interior, at Yuma, Ariz.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2361. A bill to amend the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, with respect to quota immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 2362. A bill granting a pension to Dora F. Babbitt;

S. 2363. A bill granting a pension to Georgene F. Jackson; and

S. 2364. A bill granting an increase of pension to Gail E. Plunkett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2365. A bill for the protection against unlawful use of the badge, medal, emblem, or other insignia of veterans' organizations incorporated by act of Congress, and providing penalties for the violation thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUFFEY:

S. 2366. A bill for the relief of Franklin C. Richardson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2367. A bill for the relief of Clark Wilfred Martin; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. 2368. A bill to authorize the sale of the monthly document prepared by the Treasury Department entitled "Bulletin of the Treasury Department"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2369. A bill to make available certain sums to States which failed in 1936 or 1937 to take full advantage of the credit provisions of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. OVERTON:

S. 2370. A bill for the relief of Corinne W. Bienvenu (nee Corinne Wells); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. J. Res. 126. Joint resolution to amend the act to authorize alterations and repairs to certain naval vessels, and for other purposes, approved April 20, 1939; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. J. Res. 127. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to provide for the national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution to amend section 5 of Public, No. 360, Sixty-sixth Congress; and

S. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution authorizing the Osage Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution referring the claims of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma to the Court of Claims for finding of fact and report to Congress; and

S. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and ascertain a certain claim on the part of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 4997. An act giving the consent and approval of Congress to the Rio Grande compact signed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., on March 18, 1938; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 5643. An act to invest the circuit courts of appeals of the United States with original and exclusive jurisdiction to review the order of detention of any alien ordered deported from the United States whose deportation or departure from the United States otherwise is not effectuated within 90 days after the date the warrant of deportation shall have become

final; to authorize such detention orders in certain cases; to provide places for such detention; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT, 1938—AMENDMENT

Mr. DOWNEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2008) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed.

#### AMENDMENTS TO AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DOWNEY submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5269, the Agricultural Department appropriation bill, 1940, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 55, line 6, to strike out "\$200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$253,000."

On page 55, line 8, to strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "Provided further, That \$53,000 of such amount shall be available for expenditure only for the control of the pine-bark beetle in the State of California."

On page 59, line 13, to strike out "\$4,967,401" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,020,401."

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted an amendment relative to the exportation of cotton or cotton articles, etc., intended to be proposed by him to House bill 5269, the Agricultural Department appropriation bill, 1940, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### SENATOR FROM INDIANA—EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATION

Mr. GEORGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 130), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or a subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate not to exceed \$100 for expenses incurred incident to the investigation of the election in 1938 of a Senator from the State of Indiana.

#### MONETARY POWERS (S. DOC. NO. 72)

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury relative to the extension of monetary powers in response to a letter I sent to him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### STUDIES OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION—WORK OF THE SESSION—FINAL ADJOURNMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is one resolution coming over from a previous day which will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read Senate Concurrent Resolution 15, submitted by Mr. BANKHEAD on the 2d instant.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the concurrent resolution be placed on the table calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE LATE SENATOR CUTTING—ADDRESS BY HON. SAM G. BRATTON

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, Saturday last, the 6th day of May, was the anniversary of the tragic and untimely death of former United States Senator Bronson M. Cutting. On that day on the capitol grounds in the city of Santa Fe, N. Mex., a statue, which had been provided by friends and admirers of the late Senator Cutting, was dedicated, and on that occasion an eloquent tribute was paid by another former Member of this body, the present United States circuit judge, Hon. Sam G. Bratton. I ask unanimous consent that the well-deserved tribute paid to former Senator Cutting by Judge Bratton on that occasion be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ADDRESS BY HON. SAM G. BRATTON AT THE DEDICATION OF THE STATUE OF THE LATE SENATOR BRONSON M. CUTTING

We are assembled in this ancient city on this beautiful afternoon in midspring with the opulence of nature's boundless resources on every hand to pay earnest tribute to a friend of yesteryear whose career was cut short with tragic suddenness at an early age. I participate in these proceedings with a spirit of humility and in gratitude for a great life. It is hoped that you will appreciate how wholly inadequate my mother tongue is in expressing my deep feelings on this occasion.

Bronson Murray Cutting was born June 23, 1888, at Oakdale, Long Island, N. Y., the son of William Bayard and Olivia Peyton (Murray)

Cutting. He received his education at Groton and Harvard. He entered Groton in September 1901, was there 5 years, and was graduated in June 1906. He entered Harvard in the autumn of 1906, was forced on account of ill health to leave temporarily during his junior year, and finished with his B. A. degree in 1910. His record in scholarship at each institution was remarkable. At the early age of 10 he spoke French and German almost as easily as English, and he later mastered Spanish, Arabic, and other languages. In addition to being an accomplished linguist, he was an educated man in a real sense. Life itself was his education. It began almost at the cradle and continued throughout his life. It consisted of literature, music, art, experience, travel, people, and work. He came to New Mexico in 1910 in search of health. He was restored to good health and remained until his tragic death in an airplane crash in Missouri on May 6, 1935, 4 years ago today. Although 4 years have intervened, our affection for him is as fresh today as it was then.

It may be assumed with confidence that Bronson Cutting spent his period of convalescence in a careful study of political conditions then existing in the Territory of New Mexico, and that as the result of a painstaking survey of the situation he developed a virile interest in the problems which then confronted the people here. He took a lively interest in the first election after statehood and continued to devote himself as a private citizen to the solution of public questions as they arose from time to time until the entry of the United States into the World War. Despite a physical handicap which might have deterred one with less force and determination, he volunteered, was commissioned as a captain, and rendered service of high order both at home and abroad. At the conclusion of that service he returned to civil life of a quiet and unostentatious character, as was his wont. While he served in many capacities in the State, his first call to official service of national scope came in 1927. On December 29 of that year Gov. Richard C. Dillon appointed him United States Senator from New Mexico to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Andrieus A. Jones. He served under that recess appointment until December 1928. In November 1928 he was elected United States Senator for a full term of 6 years and he was reelected in 1934 for a second term.

When the background of Senator Cutting is rightfully understood and appraised, it is easily understood how coincident with the repair of his health and physique he developed a deep understanding of conditions here and an acute sympathy for those who needed assistance in their quest for better government and improved conditions in which to live and rear and educate their sons and daughters for useful citizenship. He came to maturity in an era of reform, and he was from the beginning thoroughly at home in that era. His birth coincided with the beginning of the Populist movement and that of socialism, his boyhood with that quest for social justice which is the distinguishing mark of the "nineties," his youth with Roosevelt-La Follette liberalism. No other period in our history has been so elaborately and self-consciously concerned with reform, and that reform reached into every nook and corner of our life. It inquired into the plight of the farmer and of the laborer; it illuminated conditions of life in the slums of the great cities; it agitated woman's rights and the welfare of children; it probed into the dark places of prisons and reformatories; it interested itself in the Negro and the Indian; it faced squarely the problems of drunkenness and vice; it addressed itself to corruption and maladministration in high places; it grappled with the great problems of public education; and it concerned itself with matters of religion. It was in truth a crusading era, an era in which men were conscious as never before to fulfill the promise of American life.

To all this Bronson Cutting could not be immune, nor did his wealth and social position embarrass him. Wealth was on the defensive; some thought it was a disgrace to be rich. The Cuttings needed no admonition on this score. There was no disposition on the part of that family to evade the responsibilities of wealth nor any reluctance to join in the quest for social justice, economic equalitarianism, and political democracy.

Bronson Cutting was born to wealth and social position, but not to conservatism. His family, on both sides, had a distinguished record for liberalism in politics and activity in social reform. His grandfather, Bronson Murray, whose name he bore, was an abolitionist when abolitionism was looked upon much as is communism today, an eager advocate of woman's rights, and of religious liberalism. His father, Bayard Cutting, was throughout his life allied with the forces of social and political reform in New York City; he was long a leader of civil-service reform, a pioneer in slum clearance, generous alike with time and money in forwarding those educational, religious, and charitable causes which enlisted his broad sympathies. It was characteristic of Senator Cutting's father that he was one of the few New York businessmen who from the beginning enthusiastically supported Theodore Roosevelt in his efforts to control trusts, regulate railroads, and cleanse public life. It is equally characteristic that Bronson Cutting's first political memory was of his sympathy for William Jennings Bryan in the historic campaign of 1896. He was then just 8 years old, but the campaign made a lasting impression upon his keen and absorbing mind.

Senator Cutting's material inheritance was important, and it enabled him to do many things which otherwise would have been difficult, if not impossible, of performance. But more important was the intellectual inheritance; a profound sense of his obligation to society; and implicit assumption that wealth was not a personal possession but a trust and a social responsibility; a lively sensitiveness to the misfortunes and deprivations of the underprivileged; and a passionate, though never intemperate, desire to contribute to



the creation of an economy which should provide opportunities for all, a society which should insure equality in access to those opportunities, and a government which should protect those who were unfitted for the struggle of competition.

Bronson Cutting's education did not wean him away from this inheritance. Groton and Harvard did not impair his sense of social obligation any more than they impaired the passion of Franklin Delano Roosevelt for social justice. Groton was a rich man's school, but it was not entirely isolated from the America of the nineteen hundreds. There were lectures on subjects of social and political interests, debates on such questions as public ownership of railroads or regulation of trusts; there was a summer camp maintained for the poor of Boston and New York in which Bronson Cutting served. And for all of its prestige and antiquity, Harvard has always been a stronghold of liberalism, has always encouraged independence of thought, individualism of expression, and social consciousness. It may be remarked in passing that Bronson Cutting was in the same class with Walter Lippman, Jack Reed, Heywood Broun, and a dozen others who later distinguished themselves by their independence.

Inheritance and education gave to Senator Cutting a disdain for material and social possessions. These things came too easy and were to be taken for granted. What he developed was an intense anxiety to justify himself and his life on other grounds, to contribute something of his own to the cultural and social welfare of the country. It is interesting that he did not need to make money, interesting but not significant; it is significant that he never cared to try. From the beginning he had other and more important business at hand. Before his break-down in health which brought him out here that business was primarily intellectual; he planned to devote himself to archeology; but after his arrival here that business was social and political reform. At no time was it merely material or merely personal. New Mexico contributed much to the education of Bronson Cutting, but his first awareness of the need for social reform and his inspiration to social consciousness were deeply implanted long prior to the time when he established citizenship among us. New Mexico furnished him an opportunity for the practical application of that which had been theoretical, an opportunity to make concrete and tangible that which had been vague and intangible, an opportunity to give sense of realism and immediacy to his social consciousness. It is safe to conjecture that Senator Cutting would never have been the sterling crusader that he was had it not been for his background and training; and it is equally safe to assert with confidence that he never would have brought into full exertion his potential possibilities had it not been for the rich opportunity which New Mexico supplied to educate him to human realities.

This early environment and training implemented by the rare opportunity which New Mexico generously extended for practical application of his concepts respecting social and economic questions lends ready answer to the often propounded query why he possessed such a crusading spirit for public welfare. By inheritance and by early training, he instinctively championed the cause of the helpless and the unfortunate, he unfailingly went to the rescue of the underprivileged, he was always on the side of the masses.

The rise of Bronson Cutting in the Senate of the United States was meteoric. He was a member of the Committees on Banking and Currency, Foreign Relations, Irrigation and Reclamation, Manufactures, Military Affairs, and Public Lands and Surveys. Membership on these important committees enabled him to render invaluable service of the highest order to his constituents in New Mexico and to the Nation as a whole. His achievements were many for the reason that he possessed in large measure the qualifications and the indefatigable industry to overcome difficulties and to accomplish hard legislative tasks. He devoted himself with unflagging industry to legislation affecting veterans of the World War, veterans of the Spanish War, veterans of other wars, and their dependents. He concerned himself with measures relating to agriculture, air mail, banking, civil service, interstate and foreign commerce, holding companies, home financing, labor, military affairs, national defense, public utilities, and relief. He mastered every question with which he concerned himself. He illuminated every question he discussed. He graced every cause he espoused. He ennobled every duty he performed. He weighed questions with great care. He reached conclusions with deliberation and caution; but once he formed a definite conviction upon a question affecting public welfare, he was unshakable in his support or opposition, as the case might be. He was brave, imperious, and incorruptible. It mattered not to him whether a cause was popular. His inquiry was whether it was right. If so, he supported it with all the vigor at his command. If wrong, he waged withering opposition with no thought of the political consequences to himself. He was valiant for truth. He loved justice and ordered liberty; he hated wrong and oppression; he stood firmly for truth and virtue; he was uncompromising against that which was false; he was insensible to the attack of the demagogue; he was deaf to the blandishments of the flatterer. He bore daily in mind the admonition:

"This above all; to thine own self be true  
And it must follow, as the night the day,  
Thou canst not then be false to any man."

It was his belief that there are no short-cuts to wisdom, influence, and service; and that after all the centuries of invention and progress the path of the soul often lies through the thorny wilderness which still must be trod, sometimes in solitude. He believed

that the greatest need of the hour was clear and calm thinking, and for Americans to rise to the height of the opportunity for self-improvement and effective leadership. To him the problem was not one of sectional discord or internal differences. It was one of making certain that democratic impulses do not grow weaker under pressure or false doctrines or insidious propaganda; it was one of keeping a clear vision upon the substance of institutional arrangements designed to protect and preserve the attributes of personal freedom and the perpetuity of free institutions.

A real farmer prefers to fall among his growing crops; a real physician prefers to fall on a mission of mercy; a real soldier prefers to fall with drawn sword in hand. Bronson Cutting, the eminent statesman and faithful public servant, fell as he would have preferred to fall, en route to his post of duty in the Senate, there to join with others in supporting to the utmost a program of legislation which would contribute to organized society and to liberal democracy. His death was an irreparable loss. Men and women throughout New Mexico and in all parts of the Nation mourn his departure. We miss him tremendously. His like will not soon pass this way again. Let us take courage in the words of Longfellow:

"There is no death,  
What seems so is transition;  
This life of mortal breath  
Is but a suburb of the life Elysian,  
Whose portal we call death."

#### THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL—SCULPTOR OF JEFFERSON'S STATUE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, as a representative of the United States Senate on the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission it has been a duty to provide for the selection of a sculptor for the statue of Jefferson which will be placed in the memorial. In making preliminary surveys about the proper method to follow, our Commission listened to the recommendations of many persons in our Government who represent those departments which are responsible for buildings, monuments, and governmental art. I am sure that all members of the Commission were happy in learning of the remarkable talent available to the Government in the creation of symbols which reflect the ideals of American institutions. As an example of the spirit of many who are giving to the American people this inspiration, I am presenting for the RECORD a short address delivered as a report to the President of the United States by Edward Bruce, Chief of the Section of Fine Arts of the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department. As this speech is, I know, of interest to the American people, I ask, Mr. President, unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, this, I suppose, is the first time in history that the head of a great state has asked his advisors to consider the work of a group of unknown but very talented artists. The reason why, as we all know, is the kindness of our President's heart. It makes me realize how times have changed from the days when I first came to Washington, when the then President was, may I say, Hoover-ing over the White House.

In the limited time at my disposal I want to make three points about the program of the Section of Fine Arts. When the Secretary of the Treasury organized the section, his only instruction to us was to carry out the work in such a way as will assist in the development of art in this country and reward what is regarded as the outstanding talent which develops. To carry out this program we have set up a system of national and local competitions which are conducted as fairly as we know how to conduct them. They are open to all and are absolutely anonymous. Our juries are constantly changed and in certain cases we have even allowed the artists themselves to elect their own jury. We are constantly considering ways of improving our program and insuring impartial judgment. The integrity of our program is a sacred thing to all of us. No artist, however great his name, has had a job from our section without earning it on a merit basis.

I think primarily of the Section of Fine Arts as an accomplishment in democracy. Prior to the organization of the section there was no thought of a merit system. Commissions were given to friends and competitions were never used. It seems to me a very fine thing that today when the Government has a commission to give an American artist the artist may, like St. Paul, announce his citizenship and as a matter of right claim an opportunity to have his talent tested on a merit system. It makes the nice phrases in the Declaration of Independence mean something in these days when the rights of man are pretty much in the scrap basket. The group of distinguished gentlemen who used to get all the business must now compete on a merit system.

I would like to call your attention to the map at the end of the room. This is really my favorite picture. It shows how widely we are distributing our art over the country. There is a mural or piece of sculpture either completed or planned for every button on the map. I have before me the prices which the Government paid

for works of painting or sculpture in six of the large Federal buildings in Washington. These figures show that in the case of two buildings, the Supreme Court and the Archives Building, the Government spent for painting and sculpture \$630,400. This figure of \$630,400 is exactly \$42,638.61 more than the Section of Fine Arts has paid for the decoration of 420 Federal buildings. It really is nearly \$50,000 more than the Government paid for all the completed work which is shown on that map. The reason, I think, that there has been such universal approval of the work of our program is the fact that it has been so modest. The amount we receive to carry on our work is limited to 1 percent of the cost of each Federal building. In fact, we are developing a slogan, "One percent for art in every building."

Mr. Mellon paid \$15,868,515 for 59 of the pictures which he has presented to his National Gallery in his magnificent gift. The average cost of these pictures was \$31,622 per square foot. The average cost of all the murals that have been executed by the Section of Fine Arts has been \$14 per square foot. I do not say that our pictures are now worth Mr. Mellon's prices, but I do say, with absolute belief, that in the due process of time the Government will find it has made a very good bargain and that these pictures will be valued at one hundredfold the prices which the Government has paid for them. At all events I think it is safe to estimate that the artists who painted these pictures originally received less for them than the prices which the Government is paying.

For my last point I would like to spend a few minutes talking about the pictures around this room. They are not prize pictures. They are just the run of the mine. Every one of them was sent in a little competition which we have just held for a mural decoration for the post office in Wausau, Wis. The competition was limited to artists residing in Wisconsin and Illinois. There are no famous names among them. I doubt if any one of you has ever heard of one of them. They are, however, all works of art of distinction.

I hope you will all look at these pictures. I think if you do that you will realize that any one of them would make a country post office a pleasanter place to come to. They make me feel very comfortable about America. I do not believe that one of these artists who painted these pictures likes either Hitler or Mussolini. I have a feeling that they all know and like the Twenty-third Psalm.

These pictures are typical of the thousands of pictures that have been sent in to our office under competitions. There has been no sign of defeat or social unrest among any of them. They have spread out before us a panorama of America, triumphant, clear-eyed, and unafraid, and I like to think that as time goes on we will continue to develop through our post offices little cultural centers where we are raising the taste of our country and helping to develop our native art. The Secretary of Commerce has done a superb job in developing his community art centers throughout the country. I know that in this way we are in a very real sense raising the standard of living of our people by bringing to their lives something of beauty they have never had before, and making them realize how much richer a life is when they have around them something of beauty and of good taste.

I recommend it as the best panacea I know of against all the rotten unrest that is tormenting the world today. I tried to make our artists feel, and I think they do feel, that any one of them who receives a commission from us to do a mural in a post office has received a high honor which calls for the best they have to give. I tell them of a little village I know in Italy nestling in the Appennine Hills which is called Borgo San Sepolcro. In that village there is a little town hall no bigger than the average country post office. Also, in that village lived a great artist. His name was Piero Della Francesca, and he painted there the greatest picture in the world, The Resurrection of Christ. Whenever I am in Italy I make a pilgrimage to Borgo to see that picture, and I find my soul refreshed from seeing it, as do the thousands of pilgrims who visit it each year. I hope the day may come when we, too, may develop a Piero Della Francesca.

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

#### THE STATE OF THE UNION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR VANDENBERG

[Mr. BARBOUR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the state of the Union, delivered by Senator VANDENBERG at Atlantic City on Saturday, May 7, at the twenty-fourth annual convention banquet of the Manufacturers' Association of New Jersey, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### NATIONAL HEALTH BILL—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WAGNER

[Mr. MINTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of the national health bill, delivered by Senator WAGNER on the evening of May 7, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### AMERICAN NEUTRALITY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CLARK OF MISSOURI

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered on May 5, 1939, by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] on the subject of American neutrality, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY—STATEMENT OF DR. L. W. STILWELL

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement on the foreign situation made by

Dr. L. W. Stilwell, of Dartmouth College, before the Foreign Relations Committee, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### AMERICAN NEUTRALITY—STATEMENT BY THEODORE H. HOFFMAN

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Theodore H. Hoffman, chairman of the National Council of the Steuben Society of America, on neutrality, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION—LETTER FROM H. D. WEATHERS

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from H. D. Weathers, of Evergreen, Ala., superintendent of the Conecuh County Board of Education, relative to the National Youth Administration, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—EDITORIAL FROM SHREVEPORT TIMES

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Times of Saturday, April 22, 1939, on the subject of the deportation of aliens, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### MONETARY POWERS—EDITORIAL FROM SATURDAY EVENING POST

[Mr. TOWNSEND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Power in the Closet," published in the Saturday Evening Post of May 6, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### CALL OF CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

The VICE PRESIDENT. Routine morning business having been concluded, the consideration of bills on the calendar under rule VIII is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the calling of the calendar be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

#### AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 5269, the annual supply bill for the Department of Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5269) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be read for amendment, the amendments of the committee to be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I understand the Senate is about to take a brief recess to receive a distinguished guest. I will ask that the consideration of the appropriation bill be resumed immediately following the recess.

#### RECEPTION OF THE PRESIDENT OF NICARAGUA

The VICE PRESIDENT (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.). The hour has arrived for the Senate to take a recess under its previous order.

The Senate thereupon took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate being in recess,

His Excellency General Anastasio Somoza, President of the Republic of Nicaragua, escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President, consisting of Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. PITTMAN, and Mr. McNARY, entered the Senate Chamber, accompanied by Dr. Manuel Cordero Reyes, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Nicaragua; First Lt. Octavio Sacasa, aide; Second Lt. Pedro Nolasco Romero, aide; Col. Charles B. Elliott, American military aide to President Somoza; Capt. Ernest L. Gunther, American naval aide to President Somoza; the Honorable George T. Summerlin, the Chief of Protocol, De-



partment of State; and the Honorable León De Bayle, Minister of Nicaragua at Washington.

The President of Nicaragua having been seated to the left of the Vice President, and the distinguished visitors accompanying him having been escorted to places assigned them on the Senate floor on the left side of the Chamber,

The VICE PRESIDENT said: Senators, it is my privilege to present to you the President of Nicaragua, General Anastasio Somoza. [Prolonged applause, Senators rising.]

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF NICARAGUA

PRESIDENT SOMOZA. Mr. President and Members of the Senate of the United States, it is a source of very deep satisfaction to me to have the privilege of being received by this distinguished legislative body.

I appreciate most particularly the kind words of welcome of your honorable President, Mr. GARNER, and I feel I should not decline his courteous invitation—which I consider an honor—to address you on this occasion.

I take pleasure in extending to each and every one of the Members of the Senate a most cordial personal greeting; and I wish to convey, through you, to the American people, the warmest expressions of friendship and understanding on the part of the Government and the people of Nicaragua.

Recently, in a memorable ceremony, the highest representatives of the various branches of your Government gathered under the dome of this same Capitol to commemorate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the First Congress of the United States under the Constitution.

The American people on that occasion paid a just tribute of admiration and gratitude to the founders of this great Nation, whose wisdom and patriotism, in the midst of the misfortunes and uncertainties of the period, established the fundamental principles of American democracy as set forth in your great Constitution and its Bill of Rights.

We, your neighbors to the south, felt that the commemoration of this anniversary was not foreign to the history of the development of our life as independent nations. It is well known that our founders, in establishing our republics, adopted in substance your democratic representative form of government as being the most adequate to insure the well-being and prosperity of free peoples.

From their inception this fortunate circumstance has established between the young Latin-American republics and the United States a similarity of governmental institutions based on a common devotion to the democratic ideals which we have been able to preserve in spite of the vicissitudes of time and the characteristics peculiar to each people.

The American nations have recently reaffirmed their stanch determination to preserve this heritage of our ancestors.

With a full realization of the difference in our relative capacity, I wish to state that we, the nations smallest in size, are ready, to the limit of our ability, to share with you, the greatest and most powerful, all the efforts and sacrifices involved in the collective task of keeping our American institutions free from any interference foreign to our continent and to our ideology. [Applause.]

As a result of conscious efforts carried out over a long period of years by our statesmen and peoples, in spite of mistakes and temporary friction, a sentiment of collective solidarity, mutual respect, and reciprocal cooperation has been created which happily now prevails in inter-American relations.

If the advances of pan-Americanism were slow in the past, all the greater should be our satisfaction in observing the rapid progress achieved in recent years.

It is a fact—and I do not need to emphasize it—the prudent, wise, and sagacious “good-neighbor policy,” inaugurated and maintained with such success by your illustrious President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, has given a vigorous impulse to the movement for pan-American rapprochement. [Applause.]

This policy has been a powerful factor in uniting the minds of the whole continent in one sole spiritual and moral entity. The Latin-American republics are now approaching

the United States cordially, with greater confidence, in an attitude of spontaneous cooperation, and with the same sentiments of friendship that they feel toward their other sister republics.

My presence in this country and the generous hospitality that your Government has offered me are a living testimonial to the truth of this assertion.

Under these happy auspices, pan-Americanism is no longer a romantic formula of international policy. It now represents a doctrine of constructive action which takes into consideration the political as well as the economic and cultural aspects of harmonious relationships.

The new spirit which governs the affairs of the Western Hemisphere was given concrete form at the conferences at Montevideo, Buenos Aires, and Lima. These conferences established well-defined bases for the inter-American order, setting forth as fundamental principles of our continental organization the juridical equality of treatment and of opportunity in international trade and the determination to defend the integrity of our territory and of our institutions against any foreign action or interference whatsoever.

This is the gospel of peace and freedom which the Americas, with the powerful assistance of the United States, present to a troubled world. Small though their contribution may be, the Nicaraguan people are, nevertheless, as proud as any other, of their cooperation in these fundamental achievements.

Because of her geographic position, and the fortunate configuration of her territory, Nicaragua, in spite of her size, will be called upon to be a complementary factor, indispensable to any plan or combination of forces for the security and defense of this continent. Her territory offers a convenient route for the construction of an interoceanic canal.

The Nicaraguan people consider this fact as their most valuable source of potential prosperity. We earnestly desire that this gift of nature may not be left hidden indefinitely in our native forests, when, by the act of man, it could bring incalculable benefits to ourselves, to you, to the Americans as a whole, and to the commerce of the world. [Applause.]

By a treaty which we are willing to carry through in terms which conform to the interests of both parties, on permanent bases of equity and justice, the United States has long been associated with Nicaragua in the possible realization of this mighty undertaking. We have thus joined our international destiny to yours, confident that this association will always be maintained in an atmosphere of reciprocal amity, of mutual benefits, and of a real comprehension of the needs and character of both nations. Those who are now engaged, as I am, wholeheartedly in the consolidation of this association of our destinies, firmly believe that when history records its judgment on future events, posterity will not betray our present hopes and convictions. [Prolonged applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is a desire on the part of Senators to meet our distinguished guest, and the Chair will ask the President pro tempore the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] to present Members of the Senate to the President of Nicaragua.

The President of Nicaragua advanced to the area in front of the Vice President's desk, accompanied by Mr. PITTMAN and by the Secretary of the Senate, and greeted the Members of the Senate as they were introduced to him.

The President of Nicaragua and the distinguished visitors accompanying him were then escorted from the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT (at 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) called the Senate to order, and legislative session was resumed.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF NICARAGUA (S. DOC. NO. 73)

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a public document the very gracious address delivered today by the President of Nicaragua to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5269) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of Agriculture—Office of the Secretary—Salaries", on page 2, line 6, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "\$581,920" and insert "\$620,720", so as to read:

For the Secretary of Agriculture, Under Secretary of Agriculture, Assistant Secretary, and for other personal services in the District of Columbia, and elsewhere, \$620,720.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, it is the purpose of the Senator from Georgia to explain the bill and its various provisions?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall be glad to explain the bill. It is, of course, a very comprehensive measure, referred to as the agricultural appropriation bill. While it provides funds for more different activities of government than does any other appropriation bill, it does not appropriate the largest amount of money. Around 2,000 various activities of the Government of the United States are carried on and maintained with funds which are provided for by this measure. Unless some Senator requests specific information as to an item, I shall confine my remarks at this time to the major Senate amendments to the House bill.

While the total sum appropriated in the bill as reported to the Senate is \$1,216,000,000, less than \$100,000,000 of that amount goes to carry on the ordinary activities of the Department of Agriculture. There are a great many other items in the bill.

In view of the reorganization proposals submitted by the President this year for the last time the bill carries funds to carry on the activities of the Bureau of Public Roads and for other highway building activities, aggregating more than \$215,000,000. Appropriations are also contained in the bill for the Weather Bureau, for furnishing weather reports to the air lines and aviation interests of the Nation.

The largest sums, of course, are the funds that are appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Soil Conservation Act, making payments to farmers for diverting their lands from soil-depleting crops to soil-conserving crops, and for carrying on the soil-conservation practices, and conservation practices generally.

As the report of the committee will show, the bill as reported to the Senate from the Committee carries \$381,000,000 more than the bill which passed the House. That increase is almost wholly found in three items; one an item of \$225,000,000 for the purpose of making parity payments under section 303 of the Agricultural Act of 1938; \$113,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 32 providing for the removal of agricultural surpluses; and \$25,000,000, which is a reimbursable item, for the purpose of making loans to tenant farmers to enable them to become home owners and landowners.

I should like to direct the attention of the Senate to the fact that the farmers of this Nation, in cooperating in carrying out the plan suggested by the Congress of the United States to benefit the condition of agriculture, have been expecting and looking to the time when they would receive parity prices for the five basic commodities which are dealt with in the Agricultural Act of 1938. Last year the Congress appropriated \$212,000,000 for the purpose of making price-adjustment or parity payments to farmers. The bill as it came to the Senate from the House did not contain a single dollar for that purpose. Therefore the Senate amendment represents only an increase of \$13,000,000 over the amount that was available for that purpose during the current fiscal year. Without this appropriation the income of the farmer that is represented by benefit payments from the Government will be reduced more than 30 percent in 1940 below the amount that is available during the current year. Any such

reduction will have a disastrous effect not only to the income of the farmer but in securing cooperation in the long-range program that looks to the distribution and removal of the huge surpluses which were accumulated during the time when there was no control program in effect in that period following the invalidation by the Supreme Court of the original Agricultural Adjustment Act.

The next item, Mr. President, is the appropriation of \$113,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 32. This appropriation has a twofold purpose. A large part of it is used for the purchase of surpluses, such as butter, potatoes, and all forms of fruits and vegetables, and those edibles are distributed to persons on relief and to those who have been certified for relief but who have not been able to get on the relief rolls. From that standpoint it is in the nature of a relief appropriation. From the other standpoint it maintains the price level that the farmer receives for his product.

The testimony before the committee disclosed that the outlook for some of these commodities for next year is very gloomy. That is particularly true in regard to the dairy industry, in which there is a considerable surplus of butter, and I understand that the prices for other dairy products are very largely controlled by the price of butter. The amount provided in the bill does not represent an increase of \$113,000,000 over the appropriations for the current year, as might be apparent at first blush, because last year \$144,000,000 was available for that purpose under the allocation of 30 percent of the customs duties, which is provided in section 32. This year that amount has decreased to \$90,000,000 due to the shrinkage in customs receipts, so if the Congress does not afford additional funds for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 32 there will be a reduction of \$54,000,000 in the funds which would be available for that item, when according to all the testimony adduced before the committee there is a greater need this year than was the case last year.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MINTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KING. I am interested in the observation just made by the Senator from Georgia with respect to the customs duties. Are the customs duties which are made available for the agricultural activities of the Government included in the appropriation carried in the pending bill, or are they in addition to this enormous appropriation of more than a billion dollars?

Mr. RUSSELL. They are in addition, because they represent a permanent allocation. The Senator is familiar, of course, with the provisions of section 32, which set up as a permanent appropriation an amount equal to one-third of the customs receipts. The \$113,000,000 is in addition to the \$90,000,000, but when the \$113,000,000 and the \$90,000,000, added together, are considered and compared with the sum which is available this year, it will be found that there is an increase of only \$69,000,000 over the current year, whereas all the testimony before the committee disclosed that there is a greater need for funds this year than there had ever been before. As a matter of fact, it was strongly insisted before the committee that without an appropriation of \$150,000,000 the Department would be unable to maintain the prices of the commodities which are dealt with under section 32, even at their present very low level.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the explanation of the Senator indicates that automatically one-third of all the customs receipts go to the Department of Agriculture for utilization as the Secretary sees fit, and there is no accounting, so far as the appropriation bills are concerned, of this very large fund, which may increase if our exports and imports also increase. It seems to me it is a very unwise system of bookkeeping, to take a large fund, perhaps \$100,000,000—and as our imports increase perhaps the fund may be two or three hundred million dollars—and allocate that money without any consideration of it being taken in the



appropriation bill. It seems to me it is a very unwise policy, as it does not permit proper bookkeeping. It gives to the agricultural activities \$100,000,000, or whatever one-third of the customs receipts may be, in addition to the large appropriations carried in the appropriation bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. The observation of the Senator as to the wisdom or folly of the provisions of section 32 are interesting, but they are not pertinent at this time, because we cannot change the existing law in this appropriation bill. Legislation permanently allocating 30 percent of the customs duties has already been enacted by the Congress, and any change in that provision made in this bill would be legislation, and would be subject to a point of order, as required by the rules.

I may state that the Committee on Finance would doubtless be the proper committee to consider any permanent change in the provisions of section 32.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. This customs duties fund, as I understand, is allocated to the Department of Agriculture for specific purposes, not for general purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The provisions of section 32 set out very specifically and definitely the purposes for which the money can be expended, and reports are filed with the Congress as to the use of these funds.

The hearings before the Senate Appropriations Committee will show exactly for what purposes these funds have been expended. I do not think there has been any reckless expenditure of the funds. In the past the Department has not spent any considerable portion of them unless a very great need existed. I should like to point out to the Senator from Utah that in 1937 one-third of the customs receipts amounted to \$109,000,000. The Department had it all in its hands and could have expended it all if it had desired, but spent only \$16,000,000 of that money. The rest reverted to the Treasury. If there had been a reappropriation, as is the case with respect to other items, it would not have been necessary to increase by one dime the money to be expended for carrying out the provisions of section 32 in this bill.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. It is true, is it not, that the money available to the Department from the collections of customs duties is available under the provisions of section 32, a permanent provision of law, so that the bookkeeping, as far as concerns the items in connection with carrying out the provisions of section 32, has nothing to do with the present appropriation bill. Is it not just the same as though that money had been appropriated for the uses set out in section 32? The effect is just the same, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. The money has been appropriated, and it would require—

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; it has been appropriated by that permanent law, and it is just the same as though we were appropriating the same amount of money in the pending bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Nebraska is undoubtedly correct, because that is a permanent appropriation continuing from year to year, and unless there is some change in the substantive law, found in section 32, that appropriation will continue from year to year.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KING. Obviously what the Senator has stated is true. Nevertheless, the agricultural appropriation bill itself would not indicate the amount and the purposes for which it is to be expended. Of course, we can go to the general law and learn the amount of the authorization.

Mr. RUSSELL. The permanent appropriation is not carried in the annual appropriation bill.

Mr. President, the other item of consequence which goes to make up the increase suggested by the Senate committee over the House provisions is an increase to \$50,000,000 in the sum available for loans to tenant farmers and sharecroppers to enable them to become farm owners and home owners.

This program has just gotten under way. The first appropriation for this purpose was \$15,000,000. The authorization last year was \$25,000,000, and the full amount was appropriated. This year the authorization is \$50,000,000; and on the basis of testimony that was submitted to us, the Senate committee felt that the problem was very important and far-reaching, and that we should appropriate the full amount.

Bear in mind, this is not an outright expenditure or a grant. It is a loan on good security, farm lands, at 3½ percent interest, to be repaid by the tenant farmer and by the sharecropper we are seeking to help. In view of the fact that the Congress has authorized an increase to \$4,000,000,000 in the amount of mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration for urban buildings, has appropriated \$800,000,000 for slum clearance and has before it legislation looking to the appropriation of \$800,000,000 additional for slum clearance, the committee felt that we could not say to the three and a half million tenant farmers and sharecroppers of the Nation, who are living in slums that are as bad or worse than those found in any city of the land, that we propose to cut the authorization and allow only \$25,000,000.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LOGAN. Has the Senator any information as to the expenditure of the \$25,000,000 which was appropriated last year? Has it all been expended? Just what progress has been made under the Farm Tenancy Act up to the present time?

Mr. RUSSELL. The entire amount has been obligated, but all of it has not yet been expended. As I recall the figures, in round numbers approximately 11,000 tenant farmers have been reached in the beginning of the program.

Of course, the Senator is familiar with the basis of distribution of the fund. There is a formula in the basic act which provides that the funds shall be distributed on the basis of farm population and the number of farm tenants within the several States. Of course, the money loaned will be repaid to the Government. If it is not repaid in full, the Government holds the title to the farm lands which are purchased for the tenant.

Speaking for myself, I regret that the authorization for this purpose is not larger, so that the credit of the Government might be extended in a sum of at least \$100,000,000 a year, in an effort to combat the rising tide of farm tenancy, and to give some hope for the future to those in our Nation who are at the very bottom of our economic heap, and who have the lowest standards of living of any people in the country.

Mr. LOGAN. Is it not true that apparently the tenant farmer and the sharecropper are in greater need of help from the Government than many who live in slums, and who have been otherwise helped by the Government? Is not \$50,000,000 for this year entirely too small an amount to carry out the program?

Mr. RUSSELL. In my opinion, the sum is wholly inadequate, but I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that it is much better than the \$25,000,000 provided in the bill as it came from the House, and is as much as the committee could appropriate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not also true that the problem is not sectional or local? The problem of farm tenancy touches practically all the great agricultural States in the Nation. The truth is that the greatest advance in farm tenancy in recent years has been noted in some of the great Middle Western farm States, such as the great State of Iowa and other States. Is that not true?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not familiar with the exact location of the increase in farm tenancy, and I have not sought to break it down by States. However, it is a fact that due to the economic straits to which the agricultural population of the Nation have been subject in recent years, an average

of 50,000 home owners and farm owners in this country each year have been driven into farm tenancy or into being sharecroppers. The number of farm owners in the country has been decreasing instead of increasing. The pittance of \$50,000,000 will not stem the rising tide of increasing tenancy, but it will afford as much of a dam as the committee was able to give, because it is the full amount of the authorization.

Mr. HILL. The \$50,000,000 is a much smaller sum than Congress is appropriating for the United States Housing Authority, which deals with slum clearance in the big cities. Is that not true?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Alabama is familiar with the fact that we have already appropriated \$800,000,000 for that purpose, and other legislation is pending providing for an appropriation of an additional \$800,000,000. In addition to that appropriation, of course, those who reside in the buildings which are erected as a result of the slum-clearance program receive a subsidy in their rent. That is not the case in the farm-tenancy program. It will pay its own way.

I do not like to make comparisons; but I will say that the amount appropriated by the bill, the full amount of the authorization of \$50,000,000, is disproportionate when we consider the needs of farm tenants and sharecroppers compared to the needs of those in cities. The need in both instances is great; but certainly the need of three and a half million families, represented by that number of tenant farmers in this country, would warrant a greater appropriation than \$50,000,000.

Mr. HILL. Fifty million dollars is one-sixteenth of what we have appropriated for the slum-clearance program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am hopeful that some legislation along the line of that suggested by the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] will be enacted at this session of the Congress to enable us to attack the problem on a wider front. However, as the matter stands before us today, all the Senate can do is to agree to the committee amendment increasing the appropriation for loans by the sum of \$25,000,000.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I correctly understand the junior Senator from Georgia to say that the bill merely increases the amount available for loans, and that the existing or basic law is not changed in any manner whatever?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Farm Tenancy Act is not affected at all. The original act provided for an authorization of \$50,000,000 this year, to be expended for the purpose of making loans. Of course, the committee did not undertake to change the basic law. It only appropriated the amount authorized by existing law.

There is one other matter which I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate, and that is the matter of parity-payment appropriations. In the amendment appropriating \$225,000,000 there is a proviso that in the event any of the five basic farm commodities dealt with in the Agricultural Act of 1938 attain a market price equal to three-fourths of parity no funds shall be expended from this appropriation for the purpose of making parity payments in connection with that commodity. In other words, we are not undertaking to bring the farmer full parity. We are merely seeking to insure to the farmer 75 percent of parity. The Congress, after long and careful deliberation, has enacted a farm bill which has as its objective, as it is stated in place after place, bringing the farmer's income up to parity. The basic farm commodities are selling today for half of parity. We cannot afford to defeat an appropriation which will in some measure tend to bring about a nearer approach to parity.

We all hope it will not be necessary to spend one dime of the funds. If wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, and rice next year bring 75 percent of parity, not a nickel of the funds appropriated will be spent; but the funds are provided to insure against some catastrophe and the suffering and distress which would ensue in the farm homes of the Nation if the

basic farm commodities should bring less than three-fourths of parity.

The bill contains a large number of other amendments. Most of them are relatively small. I shall not undertake to discuss all the amendments at this time. If any Senator desires an explanation of any amendment when it is reached, I shall be glad to endeavor to explain its purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, on page 2, line 6.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 13, after the word "cotton", to strike out "or apples", so as to make the additional proviso read:

*Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used for the payment of any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture who, as such officer or employee, or on behalf of the Department or any division, commission, or bureau thereof, issues, or causes to be issued, any prediction, oral or written, or forecast with respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous expenses, Department of Agriculture", on page 5, line 11, after the word "designate", to strike out "\$108,250" and insert "\$111,450", so as to read:

For stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment, freight, express, and drayage charges, advertising and press clippings, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs, and alterations; for the maintenance, repair, and operation of one motorcycle and not to exceed three motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles (including one for the Secretary of Agriculture, one for general utility needs of the entire Department, and one for the Forest Service) and purchase of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle at not to exceed \$1,500, including the exchange value of one such vehicle, for official purposes only; for official traveling expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field for any bureau, office, or service of the Department; and for other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department, which are authorized by such officer as the Secretary may designate, \$111,450.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 23, after the word "That", to insert "except to provide materials required in or incident to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic product is available", so as to make the additional proviso read:

*Provided further*, That, except to provide materials required in or incident to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic product is available, no part of the funds appropriated by this act shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from commodities or materials produced outside of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, at the end of line 8, to increase the total appropriation under the office of the Secretary of Agriculture from \$883,700 to \$925,770, so as to read:

Total, office of the Secretary, \$925,770.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of Information, salaries and expenses", on page 8, line 1, before the word "of", to strike out "\$383,040" and insert "\$385,440"; and in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$360,780" and insert "\$363,180", so as to read:

For necessary expenses in connection with the publication, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, documents, and reports, including labor-saving machinery and supplies, envelopes, stationery and materials, office furniture and fixtures, photographic equipment and materials, artists' tools and supplies, telephone and telegraph service, freight and express charges; purchase and maintenance of bicycles; purchase of manuscripts; traveling expenses; electrotypes, illustrations, and other expenses not otherwise provided for, \$385,440, of which not to exceed \$363,180 may be used for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Printing and binding", on page 8, line 25, after "(44 U. S. C. 111, 220:)", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may transfer to this appropriation from the



appropriation made for 'Conservation and use of agricultural land resources' such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection with marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and from funds appropriated to carry into effect the terms of section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c), as amended, such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection with the activities under said section 32, and from funds appropriated for parity payments under section 303 of the Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1938, such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection with such payments: *Provided further*, That the total amount that may be transferred under the authority granted in the preceding proviso shall not exceed \$600,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 16, after the word "Information", to increase the total appropriation under the Office of Information from \$1,992,610 to \$1,995,010.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Library, Department of Agriculture", on page 10, line 3, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$105,420" and insert "\$109,220", and in line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$71,600" and insert "\$75,250", so as to read:

Salaries and expenses: For purchase and exchange of books of reference, law books, technical and scientific books, periodicals, and for expenses incurred in completing imperfect series; not to exceed \$1,200 for newspapers; for dues, when authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; for salaries in the city of Washington and elsewhere; for official traveling expenses, and for library fixtures, library cards, supplies, and for all other necessary expenses, \$109,220, of which amount not to exceed \$75,250 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of Experiment Stations—Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations", on page 10, line 18, after the word "carry", to strike out "in" and insert "into", so as to read:

Adams Act: To carry into effect the provisions of an act approved March 16, 1906 (7 U. S. C. 369), entitled "An act to provide for an increased annual appropriation for agricultural experiment stations and regulating the expenditure thereof," and acts supplementary thereto, the sums apportioned to the several States to be paid quarterly in advance, \$720,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, at the end of line 9, to strike out "\$55,000" and insert "\$60,000", so as to read:

Hawaii: To carry into effect the provisions of an act entitled "An act to extend the benefits of certain acts of Congress to the Territory of Hawaii," approved May 16, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 386-386b), \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 18, after "(7 U. S. C. 369a)", to strike out "\$8,750; in all, for Alaska, \$23,750" and insert "\$10,000; in all, for Alaska, \$25,000", so as to read:

Alaska: To carry into effect the provisions of an act entitled "An act to extend the benefits of the Hatch Act and the Smith-Lever Act to the Territory of Alaska," approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), \$15,000; and the provisions of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to extend the benefits of the Adams Act, the Purnell Act, and the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 369a), \$10,000; in all, for Alaska, \$25,000.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Georgia as to this amendment and other amendments. In glancing through the bill there seem to be on pages 12, 14, and 16 appropriations under the Bankhead-Jones Act. I was wondering what they aggregate and why the separation?

Mr. RUSSELL. They are separated because the Bankhead-Jones Act relating to experiment and extension work is composed of many different items. For example, on page 12 the

appropriation is for payment to States for assisting in carrying on "research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture" by the various State experiment stations and land-grant colleges. The Bankhead-Jones Act was passed by the Congress in 1935. It provided for an increase of \$600,000 a year in the amount appropriated until the amount of \$3,000,000 was reached, and thereupon any increase would cease and the appropriation would become permanently \$3,000,000. The House did not allow this year's increment in this appropriation. The Senate committee decided to bring this appropriation up to date and to appropriate the full amount of \$3,000,000.

The maximum amount that could be appropriated for this purpose was \$5,000,000. Sixty percent of that money was to be allocated as between the several States and Puerto Rico and Hawaii. The other 40 percent was to be retained in a special reserve fund in the Department of Agriculture for work in various lines of research that were suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture himself.

The Senator from Colorado will observe on page 15 that the Senate committee did not allow the full amount for this work. We only restored this appropriation to the amount provided for the current fiscal year, which was \$1,400,000. The Secretary's special research fund is therefore \$600,000 below the authorization and below the amount that was contemplated by the Congress when it enacted the Bankhead-Jones Act in 1935.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 11, line 18.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 8, after "427-427g)", to strike out "\$2,400,000" and insert "\$3,000,000", so as to read:

Title I, Bankhead-Jones Act: For payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, pursuant to authorizations contained in title I of an act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges," approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427-427g), \$3,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 11, after the word "stations", to strike out "\$6,843,750" and insert "\$7,450,000", so as to read:

In all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations, \$7,450,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 4, after the word "Stations", to strike out "\$7,088,485" and insert "\$7,694,735", so as to read:

Total, Office of Experiment Stations, \$7,694,735, of which amount not to exceed \$150,105 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, and not to exceed \$750 shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of field work outside the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Special research fund, Department of Agriculture", on page 15, line 5, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "\$1,143,190" and insert "\$1,400,000", so as to read:

For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges," approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 427, 427b, 427c, 427f); for administration of the provisions of section 5 of the said act, and for special research work, including the planning, programming, coordination, and printing the results of such research, to be conducted by such agencies of the Department of Agriculture as the Secretary of Agriculture may designate or establish, and to which he may make allotments from this fund, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and the purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of

motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of field work outside the District of Columbia, \$1,400,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Extension Service, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico", on page 15, after line 20, to insert:

Extension work, act of April 24, 1939: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work," approved April 24, 1939 (Public, No. 41, 76th Cong.), \$300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 25, after "343f-343g)", to strike out "45,000" and insert "\$128,000", so as to read:

Puerto Rico: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act to extend the benefits of section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico," approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 343f-343g), \$128,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 2, after the word "work", to strike out "\$13,546,418" and insert "\$13,929,418", so as to read:

In all, payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico for agricultural extension work, \$13,929,418.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses", on page 17, line 17, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$545,170" and insert "\$575,170", so as to read:

Farmers' cooperative demonstration work: For farmers' cooperative demonstration work, including special suggestions of plans and methods for more effective dissemination of the results of the work of the Department of Agriculture and the agricultural experiment stations and of improved methods of agricultural practice, at farmers' institutes and in agricultural instruction, and for such work on Government reclamation projects, and for personal services in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, and all other necessary expenses, \$575,170.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 2, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "\$56,838" and insert "\$100,000", so as to read:

Cooperative farm forestry extension work: For cooperation with appropriate officials of the various States or with other suitable agencies to assist the owners of farms in establishing, improving, and renewing wood lots, shelterbelts, windbreaks, and other valuable forest growth, and in growing and renewing useful timber crops under the provisions of section 5 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor", approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 564-570), including personal services in the District of Columbia, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 3, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$892,254" and insert "\$965,416", and in line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$680,316" and insert "\$705,316", so as to read:

In all, salaries and expenses, \$965,416, of which amount not to exceed \$705,316 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 6, after the word "Service", to increase the total appropriation for the Extension Service from \$14,438,672 to \$14,894,834.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 6, to increase the grand total appropriation, office of the Secretary of Agriculture, from \$26,179,627 to \$27,547,049.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Weather Bureau, salaries and expenses", on page 21, line 21, after "(16 U. S. C. 581e)", to strike out "\$2,527,870" and insert "\$2,681,570", so as to read:

General weather service and research: For necessary expenses incident to collecting and disseminating meteorological, climatological, and marine information, and for investigations in meteorology,

climatology, seismology, evaporation, and aerology in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including \$3,930 for investigations of the relationship of weather conditions to forest fires, under section 6 of the act approved May 22, 1928 (16 U. S. C. 581e), \$2,681,570, of which not to exceed \$1,500 may be expended for the contribution of the United States to the cost of the office of the secretariat of the International Meteorological Committee, and not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended for the maintenance of a printing office in the city of Washington for the printing of weather maps, bulletins, circulars, forms, and other publications.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 14, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "\$3,334,095" and insert "\$4,105,000", so as to read:

Airways weather service and research: For promoting the safety and efficiency of aircraft as provided by section 803 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for the maintenance of stations for observing, measuring, and investigating atmospheric phenomena, including salaries and other expenses, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$4,105,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 15, after the name "Weather Bureau", to strike out "\$6,006,965" and insert "\$6,931,570", and in line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$710,299" and insert "\$757,339", so as to read:

Total, salaries and expenses, Weather Bureau, \$6,931,570, of which amount not to exceed \$757,339 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 23, to insert:

#### WEATHER BUREAU BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Weather Bureau Building: For the construction and equipment, on the site of the Weather Bureau in the District of Columbia, of the first unit of an extensible building for the use of said Bureau, including necessary alterations in the existing Weather Bureau buildings, to remain available until expended \$250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 8, to insert:

Total, Weather Bureau, \$7,181,570.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Animal Industry, salaries and expenses", on page 26, line 6, after the word "experiments", to strike out "\$792,880" and insert "\$812,880"; in line 14, after the word "appropriated", to strike out "\$238,957" and insert "\$243,957"; and in line 16, before the word "may", to strike out "\$40,000" and insert "\$45,000", so as to read:

Animal husbandry: For investigations and experiments in animal husbandry; for experiments in animal feeding and breeding, including cooperation with the State agricultural experiment stations and other agencies, including repairs and additions to and erection of buildings absolutely necessary to carry on the experiments, \$812,880, including \$12,500 for livestock experiments and demonstrations at Big Spring or elsewhere in Texas, to be available only when the State of Texas, or other cooperating agency in Texas, shall have appropriated an equal amount or, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, shall have furnished its equivalent in value in cooperation for the same purpose during the fiscal year 1940: *Provided*, That of the sum thus appropriated \$243,957 may be used for experiments in poultry feeding and breeding, of which amount \$45,000 may be used in cooperation with State authorities in the administration of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 23, after the word "products", to strike out "\$447,000" and insert "\$462,000", so as to read:

Diseases of animals: For scientific investigations of diseases of animals, including the construction of necessary buildings at Beltsville, Md., and necessary expenses for investigations of tuberculosis, serums, antitoxins, and analogous products, \$462,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 6, after the word "cattle", to strike out "\$7,175,000" and insert "\$9,800,000", so as to read:

Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease: For the control and eradication of the diseases of tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, and Bang's disease of cattle, \$9,800,000, together with the unobligated balances of the funds reappropriated under this head for the fiscal year 1939 by the Agricultural Appro-



prization Act for that year from unobligated balances of funds made available by the act of May 25, 1934 (48 Stat. 805), and section 37 of the act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612b).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 15, after the word "condemned", to strike out "in the case of tuberculous or paratuberculous animals, nor twice the amount paid or to be paid by the State, Territory, county, and municipality in the case of cattle reacting to the test for Bang's disease", so as to make the additional proviso read:

*Provided further*, That out of the money hereby appropriated no payment as compensation for any cattle condemned for slaughter shall exceed one-third of the difference between the appraised value of such cattle and the value of the salvage thereof; that no payment hereunder shall exceed the amount paid or to be paid by the State, Territory, county, and municipality where the animal shall be condemned; and that in no case shall any payment hereunder be more than \$25 for any grade animal or more than \$50 for any purebred animal.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 2, after the word "ticks", to strike out "\$475,000" and insert "\$503,940", so as to read:

Eradicating cattle ticks: For the eradication of southern cattle ticks, \$503,940.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 12, after the name "Bureau of Animal Industry", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That on and after May 1 of the fiscal year for which this appropriation is made, in any State or Territory whose legislature has been in regular session subsequent to the beginning of such fiscal year, no expenditures shall be made for these purposes until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures, or contributions other than money of the value equivalent to such expenditures, shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by the State, county, or local authorities, or by individuals or organizations concerned."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 25, after the word "printing", to strike out "\$5,412,600" and insert "\$5,433,000", so as to read:

Meat inspection: For expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Meat Inspection Act of June 30, 1906 (21 U. S. C. 95), as amended by the act of March 4, 1907 (21 U. S. C. 71-94), as extended to equine meat by the act of July 24, 1919 (21 U. S. C. 96), as authorized by section 2 (a) of the act of June 26, 1934 (31 U. S. C. 725a), and as further amended by the act of June 29, 1938 (21 U. S. C. 91), including the purchase of printed tags, labels, stamps, and certificates without regard to existing laws applicable to public printing, \$5,433,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 19, to strike out "\$15,493,312" and insert "\$18,202,652", so as to read:

In all, salaries and expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry, \$18,202,652.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals", on page 33, line 4, after the word "Industry", to strike out "\$15,493,312" and insert "\$18,202,652", and in line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$66,150" and insert "\$144,950", so as to read:

Total, Bureau of Animal Industry, \$18,202,652, of which amount not to exceed \$768,898 may be expended for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia, and not to exceed \$144,950 shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of field work outside the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Dairy Industry, salaries and expenses", on page 34, line 2, after the word "buildings", to strike out "\$641,905" and insert "\$645,905", so as to read:

Dairy investigations: For conducting investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in dairy industry, cooperative investigations of the dairy industry in the various States and inspection of renovated-butter factories, including repairs to buildings, not to exceed \$5,000 for the construction of buildings, \$645,905.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 4, before the words "of which", to strike out "\$717,405" and insert "\$721,405"; so as to read:

Total, salaries and expenses, Bureau of Dairy Industry, \$721,405, of which amount not to exceed \$343,510 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Plant Industry, salaries and expenses", on page 35, line 19, after the word "production", to strike out "\$541,121" and insert "\$561,121", so as to read:

Cereal crops and diseases: For the investigation and improvement of cereals, including corn, and methods of cereal production and for the study and control of cereal diseases, and for the investigation of the cultivation and breeding of flax for seed purposes, including a study of flax diseases, and for the investigation and improvement of broomcorn and methods of broomcorn production, \$561,121.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 20, after the word "control", to strike out "\$308,450" and insert "\$328,450", so as to read:

Forage crops and diseases: For the investigation and improvement of forage crops, including grasses, alfalfas, clovers, soybeans, lespedezas, vetches, cowpeas, field peas, and miscellaneous legumes; for the investigation of green-manure crops and cover crops; for investigations looking to the improvement of pastures; and for the investigation of forage-crop diseases and methods of control, \$328,450.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 6, after "U. S. C. 581b)", to strike out "\$255,392" and insert "\$265,392", so as to read:

Forest pathology: For the investigation of diseases of forest and ornamental trees and shrubs, including a study of the nature and habits of the parasitic fungi causing the chestnut-tree bark disease, the white-pine blister rust, and other epidemic tree diseases, for the purpose of discovering new methods of control and applying methods of eradication or control already discovered, and including \$132,569 for investigations of diseases of forest trees and forest products, under section 3 of the act approved May 22, 1928 (16 U. S. C. 581b), \$265,392.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 15, after the word "storage", to strike out "\$1,328,982" and insert "\$1,373,982", so as to read:

Fruit and vegetable crops and diseases: For investigation and control of diseases, for improvement of methods of culture, propagation, breeding, selection, and related activities concerned with the production of fruits, nuts, vegetables, ornamentals, and related plants, for investigation of methods of harvesting, packing, shipping, storing, and utilizing these products, and for studies of the physiological and related changes of such products during processes of marketing and while in commercial storage, \$1,373,982.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 2, to insert:

Rubber and other tropical plants: For investigation of crops from tropical regions and for the study and improvement of rubber plants by cultural methods, breeding, acclimatization, adaptation, and selection, and for investigation of their diseases, \$46,749.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 18, after the word "matter", to strike out "\$121,622" and insert "\$168,457", so as to read:

Soil fertility investigations: For soil investigations into causes of infertility; maintenance of productivity, effects of soil composition, cultural methods, and fertilizers on yield and quality of crops; and the properties, composition, formation, and transformation of soil organic matter, \$168,457.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 10, after the word "seed", to strike out "\$322,500" and insert "\$332,500", so as to read:

Sugar-plant investigations: For sugar-plant investigations, including studies of diseases and the improvement of sugar beets and sugar-beet seed, \$332,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 15, before the words "of which", to strike out "\$5,083,760" and insert "\$5,282,344"; in line 16, before the word "may", to strike out "\$1,736,620" and insert "\$1,805,885"; and in line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$24,575" and insert "\$25,325", so as to read:

Total, salaries and expenses, Bureau of Plant Industry, \$5,282,344, of which amount not to exceed \$1,805,885 may be expended for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia and not to exceed \$25,325 shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of field work outside the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Forest Service, salaries and expenses", on page 44, line 1, after the word "experimental", to strike out "forests" and insert "areas under administration of the Forest Service"; on page 45, line 5, after the word "Act", to strike out "\$11,819,754" and insert "\$12,004,000"; and in line 9, after the name "Idaho", to insert a colon and "Provided further, That in sales of logs, ties, poles, posts, cordwood, pulpwood, and other forest products the amounts made available for schools and roads by the act of May 23, 1908 (16 U. S. C. 500), and the act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C. 501), shall be based upon the stumpage value of the timber", so as to read:

National-forest protection and management: For the administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement, and development of the national forests, including the establishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, including the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by purchase, production, or otherwise, seeding and tree planting and the care of plantations and young growth; the maintenance and operation of aerial fire control by contract or otherwise; the maintenance of roads and trails and the construction and maintenance of all other improvements necessary for the proper and economical administration, protection, development, and use of the national forests, including experimental areas under administration of the Forest Service: *Provided*, That where, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, direct purchases will be more economical than construction, improvements may be purchased; the construction, equipment, and maintenance of sanitary, fire preventive, and recreational facilities; control of destructive forest tree diseases and insects; timber cultural operations; development and application of fish and game management plans; propagation and transplanting of plants suitable for planting on semiarid portions of the national forests; estimating and appraising of timber and other resources and development and application of plans for their effective management, sale, and use; examination, classification, surveying, and appraisal of land incident to effecting exchanges authorized by law and of lands within the boundaries of the national forests that may be opened to homestead settlement and entry under the act of June 11, 1906, and the act of August 10, 1912 (16 U. S. C. 506-509), as provided by the act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C. 512); and all expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement, protection, and general administration of the national forests, including lands under contract for purchase or for the acquisition of which condemnation proceedings have been instituted under the act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 521), and the act of June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 471, 499, 505, 564-570), lands transferred by authority of the Secretary of Agriculture from the Resettlement Administration to the Forest Service, and lands transferred to the Forest Service under authority of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, \$12,004,000: *Provided*, That \$200 of this appropriation shall be available for the expenses of properly caring for the graves of fire fighters buried at Wallace, Idaho; Newport, Wash.; and St. Maries, Idaho: *Provided further*, That in sales of logs, ties, poles, posts, cordwood, pulpwood, and other forest products the amounts made available for schools and roads by the act of May 23, 1908 (16 U. S. C. 500), and the act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C. 501), shall be based upon the stumpage value of the timber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, my attention was diverted to another matter for a moment. I inquire if the amendment, on page 45, lines 9 to 14, has been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. May I ask the able Senator from Georgia was that amendment discussed in the committee?

Mr. RUSSELL. It was discussed at considerable length. The Senator from Oregon, who has participated in writing most of the forestry laws, in recent years, is familiar with the fact that when the wood or timber is sold from national forests the States receive 25 percent of the amount received from the sale of the wood in lieu of taxes which they have

lost. After the great hurricane that devastated the New England States, and which blew down a great deal of timber in national forests we made an appropriation in the deficiency bill of \$5,000,000 to employ people and to get that timber out of the woods to the roads where it could be sold. The act provides that the States are to receive 25 percent of the stumpage value of the timber. Without this language in the bill the States in which these forests are situated would receive 25 percent of the \$5,000,000 appropriated as well as what the timber ultimately might bring. Therefore, this amendment merely provides that those States shall receive stumpage value, which is the amount they would have received if the wood had been cut without having been blown down by the hurricane.

Mr. McNARY. That is a very clear explanation. I inquire if the Forest Service requested the change?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Forest Service requested the change. The language was submitted in the Budget estimate but for some reason it was left out by the other House.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 24, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "\$593,403" and insert "\$648,403", and in line 25, after the word "which", to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$20,000", so as to read:

Forest management: Fire, silvicultural, and other forest investigations and experiments under section 2, as amended, at forest experiment stations or elsewhere, \$648,403, of which \$20,000 shall be for investigations of the lowland hardwoods in the lower Mississippi River Basin.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 6, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "\$225,935" and insert "\$245,935", so as to read:

Range investigations: Investigations and experiments to develop improved methods of management of forest and other ranges under section 7, at forest or range experiment stations or elsewhere, \$245,935.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 9, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "\$628,361" and insert "\$700,000", so as to read:

Forest products: Experiments, investigations, and tests of forest products under section 8, at the Forest Products Laboratory, or elsewhere, \$700,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 13, after the numeral "10", to strike out "\$121,295" and insert "\$131,295", so as to read:

Forest economics: Investigation in forest economies under section 10, \$131,295.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, after line 20, to insert:

Tropical forest experiment station: For the establishment and maintenance of a forest experiment station in the tropical possessions of the United States in the West Indies, pursuant to section 2 of the act of May 22, 1928 (16 U. S. C. 581a), \$30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 1, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$14,605,400" and insert "\$14,976,285"; in line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$853,349" and insert "\$862,769"; in line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$1,000" and insert "\$1,500"; and in line 13, after the word "Stations", to insert "and of the Department of Timber Utilization of the Comité International du Bois", so as to read:

In all, salaries and expenses, \$14,976,285; and in addition thereto there are hereby appropriated all moneys received as contributions toward cooperative work under the provisions of section 1 of the act approved March 3, 1925 (16 U. S. C. 572), which funds shall be covered into the Treasury and constitute a part of the special funds provided by the act of June 30, 1914 (16 U. S. C. 498): *Provided*, That not to exceed \$862,769 may be expended for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,500 may be expended for the contribution of the



United States to the cost of the office of the secretariat of the International Union of Forest Research Stations and of the Department of Timber Utilization of the Comité International du Bois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest-fire cooperation", on page 49, line 2, after the word "act", to strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$2,500,000", and in line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$62,000", so as to read:

For cooperation with the various States or other appropriate agencies in forest-fire prevention and suppression and the protection of timbered and cut-over lands in accordance with the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote continuous production of timber on lands chiefly valuable therefor," approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 564-570), as amended, including also the study of the effect of tax laws and the investigation of timber insurance as provided in section 3 of said act, \$2,500,000, of which not to exceed \$62,000 shall be available for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia and not to exceed \$2,500 for the purchase of supplies and equipment required for the purposes of said act in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Cooperative distribution of forest planting stock", on page 49, line 19, after the word "thereto", to strike out "\$70,579" and insert "\$100,000", so as to read:

For cooperation with the various States in the procurement, production, and distribution of forest-tree seeds and plants in establishing windbreaks, shelterbelts, and farm wood lots upon denuded or nonforested lands within such cooperating States, under the provisions of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor," approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567), and acts supplementary thereto, \$100,000, which amount shall be available for the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, in connection with the item relating to cooperative distribution of forest planting stock let me say that I have received some communications protesting against it. I do not pretend to know what the situation is, and so I should like to have an explanation. The protests come to me from those who are engaged in the business of developing trees, I think, for private sale. I do not know what the situation is, but, as I have said, I have received some telegrams about it and should like to know what the situation is.

Mr. RUSSELL. The item that is now under consideration by the Senate has been carried in the bill for a long number of years. In my opinion, the item to which the Senator from Colorado has reference will be found on page 102 of the bill, which is the cooperative farm forestry item under the Norris-Doxey Act and it appears in the bill for the first time this year. The item now under consideration pertains largely to national forest lands. It is part of the original McNary-Sweeney Act, I think.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 49, line 19.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Acquisition of lands for national forests", on page 50, line 6, after the word "lands", to strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$3,000,000", so as to read:

For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 513-519, 521), under sound commercial title satisfactory to the Attorney General as provided in said act, including the transfer to the Office of the Solicitor of such funds for the employment by that office of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere as may be necessary in connection with the acquisition of such lands, \$3,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$112,500 of the sum appropriated in this paragraph may be expended for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask to have that amendment passed over until a little later, and also, when it is

reached, the amendment on page 80 with reference to grading tobacco.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I will offer my amendment now. On page 50, line 6, in the committee amendment, I move to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,000,000."

I shall make only a brief statement about the amendment.

For some time the Forest Service have been asking Congress to appropriate \$10,000,000 a year to enable them to buy new forest lands over a period, so that they may have some reliance on the amount of money that will be available. I have not time to go into details about the matter; but it seems to me that the request of the Forest Service is not an unreasonable one, because we have to start in now to purchase lands available for forestry because of the shortsightedness of some of our ancestors, who allowed nearly all of the available forest lands in certain parts of the country to become owned by private interests; and now we have to go back and buy them up in order to turn them into forests. Our ancestors became a little more farsighted as our country developed toward the west, and were able, out of the public lands and otherwise, to arrange for large forest areas; but especially in the East and in the Middle West and in some parts of the far West there are still available areas for the Forest Service. There are cut-over lands that ought to be reforested. I am not asking that the request of the Forest Service be granted by appropriating \$10,000,000, but I am asking that half of that amount be provided.

The Senate committee has amended the House language by increasing the amount from \$2,000,000 to \$3,000,000. The amendment I offer is to make the amount \$5,000,000. I should like to see the House figure increased by \$3,000,000 so that the Forest Service may with some degree of assurance go ahead with its program—which it can carry out, under the amendment I offer, only to the extent of 50 percent of its desires—of purchasing available forest lands not only where there are forests in existence, but lands that have been cut over and need to be reforested, because, unless the Forest Service does this work, it is not going to be done.

I wish the Senator from Georgia, in charge of the bill, would accept the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should be glad to accept the amendment if the committee had not considered and rejected the proposal submitted by the Senator from Kentucky. I feel bound by the committee's action to state that the committee considered the \$5,000,000 amendment and voted it down, and then adopted an amendment increasing the appropriation to \$3,000,000, which is the amount provided in the act for the current year.

Of course the representatives of the Forest Service testified before the committee that there was very vital need for increased funds. They had asked the Budget Bureau for \$10,000,000, and the Budget Bureau had allowed only \$2,000,000, the amount carried in the House bill.

If the committee had not definitely voted on this question, I should be glad to accept the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky; but I feel that I am bound by the action of the committee to say that the committee did consider it, and voted it down.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator knows that the Forest Service now have under contemplation the purchase of a considerable acreage of forest lands in the Appalachian Mountains and in other parts of the country, and that they cannot go forward with that project unless they receive an increased amount.

Mr. RUSSELL. That was the testimony which was adduced before the committee. After hearing that testimony, the committee voted to restrict the appropriation to \$3,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's attitude, and I appreciate his sympathy for the increased amount; but I hope the Senate will feel justified in increasing it.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Georgia if my recollection is correct that not only for

the current year but for the previous year the appropriation has been \$3,000,000. The purpose of the committee, as I understood the discussion, was to try to fix an amount upon which the Forest Service could rely, and, as it has been heretofore fixed at \$3,000,000, to retain that amount, instead of increasing it and decreasing it from year to year, and having the Forest Service in such a position that it would not know what amount it could rely upon having. If we stick to the appropriation of \$3,000,000, the Forest Service can make its plans accordingly.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the appropriation for the current year is \$3,000,000, and the appropriation for the preceding year was the same amount. Until that time varying amounts had been appropriated. One year the Forest Service received from emergency funds an allocation amounting to approximately \$16,000,000. The next year the Budget Bureau allowed them only \$1,000,000. There has been a great fluctuation; and for the past 3 years the Senate committee has endeavored to keep this sum at not less than \$3,000,000.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, of course, the chairman must always follow the action of his committee. I am a member ex officio of the committee, and therefore am not bound, because I was not present when this item was considered. If I had been, the result might have been different.

This probably is one of the most meritorious appropriations contained in this very large bill. Some years ago, when the late able Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Weeks, was a Member of this body, I recall that he introduced a bill which was called the forest acquisition bill. The first appropriation under that bill was \$150,000. It gradually grew to \$500,000, and then to a million dollars. In 1926 a bill was passed, known as the Clarke-McNary bill, which authorized an annual expenditure of \$10,000,000 to acquire cut-over land in the watersheds of navigable streams.

Anyone can appreciate, from a mere glance at the matter, how full of merit an appropriation of that kind is. Under that authorization large sums have been appropriated, and particularly have been transferred by the P. W. A. and other agencies to this Department for this purpose. Large areas have been acquired in some of the Southern States and the New England States. Very little has been expended in the Western States, because they have sufficient forest areas without acquiring any more. I think the average price of the land acquired has been a little less than \$4 an acre—\$3.87 an acre. The Government acquires cut-over land where great erosion occurs, where the forests had a great deal to do with climatic conditions and the water-supply and recreation conditions of the country, and reforests them now by means of the C. C. C. camps to a large extent. In a short time these areas are protected from erosion, the rainfall is conserved, a better supply of water for municipalities is assured, and large recreation areas are afforded to the people of the country. Without the purchase by the Government of these practically worthless lands—which oftentimes are abandoned by the private owners, and go back to the States or the counties or the tax roll, and become a charge against the respective political subdivisions—this work could not be carried on.

If I had my way and were going through this bill, I would pare down many of the other appropriations, and place in this fund the amounts thus saved. In my opinion, no more desirable work is being done than taking worthless lands that have been logged off, where bare stumps appear on the soil without any evidence of reforestation, and making forests out of them.

We should have had during all the years since 1925, the year of the passage of the Clarke-McNary bill, annual appropriations of \$10,000,000; but somehow we have never been able to obtain them, because there was a lack of appreciation of the splendid work that has been done and is being done in acquiring these lands.

I am in entire sympathy with the able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] in desiring to increase this amount to \$5,000,000. If we do so, I suspect that the House will accept the amendment. It is a very small sum for such a com-

mendable purpose. While I concede the correctness of the attitude of the able Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the subcommittee, that as this matter was considered by the committee of course he should stand up nobly, as he is doing, and oppose the amendment, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky, and hope we may now have a vote on it, and that that sum of money will be appropriated by the Senate for this purpose.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of Senators to the fact that there have been purchased and added to the Forest Service during the past 10 years 15,000,000 acres. So the Forest Service has not been idle, and Congress has not been neglectful of the Forest Service, when 15,000,000 acres have been acquired in 10 years.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, standing by itself, that seems a tremendous area; but if one goes over the country and makes a study of this matter, as I did a few years ago with a special committee, 15,000,000 acres seem very small compared with the area of denuded land which should be reforested. Of course some areas have been added, and some money has been appropriated, but not sufficient.

There were 400,000 acres of lands in the East originally which should have been forested, and now the area has been reduced by at least three-fourths, much of it in the New England States, where hardwood is grown and converted into lumber, and much of it in the Great Lakes States, lands which are as bare as they were 25 or 30 years ago when the timber was removed. The Government should begin to acquire those lands and build up the forests for the benefit of those who live in the region and for the great purpose forests serve the entire Nation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNARY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Fifteen million acres, compared with the acreage of an average farm or even an average county, may seem like a tremendous acreage, and I wish to compliment the Forest Service for doing the best they could with the amount of money available. But when we consider what every other country in the world has done to preserve its forests, and the regulations in force under which a man is not even permitted to cut a tree from his own land; when we consider the welfare of our country 50 or 75 years hence in the matter of forests and the preservation and re-creation of forests, 15,000,000 acres is really a very insignificant area. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I have listened to what the chairman of the subcommittee and the Senator from Colorado have said as to the 15,000,000 acres. My information is that on July 1 a considerable acreage is to be transferred to the Forest Service from the Resettlement Administration. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia what acreage will be transferred on July 1 to the Forest Service from the Resettlement Administration.

Mr. McNARY. Is the transfer statutory, or is it to be made under an edict under the reorganization plan?

Mr. BYRNES. I wish to ascertain that from the Senator from Georgia. I remember a statement being made before the committee of a considerable acreage being transferred, but I am not familiar with the amount.

Mr. McNARY. I am anxious to know whether this is in contemplation by the President or is mandatory by statute.

Mr. BYRNES. I have just stated that I do not know, and that is what I intend to ask the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator knows a good deal about the reorganization plans.

Mr. BYRNES. I know only of the order which has come to the Senate, and I know of no order affecting this particular question. I think the Senator from Georgia has the information desired by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not have before me the exact figures as to the number of acres acquired by the Resettlement Administration under the acquisition program affecting submarginal lands. It is my recollection that approximately 8,000,000 acres were acquired. I do not know the exact number that were transferred to the Forest Service.



I may say to the Senator from Oregon that this has nothing whatever to do with the reorganization program, but the Resettlement Administration did purchase these lands with emergency funds to retire them from cultivation, on the theory that they were submarginal. While I am not sure, my recollection is that 1,500,000 acres will be transferred on the 1st of July to the Forest Service.

Mr. McNARY. That is submarginal land.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is adjacent to forest areas.

Mr. McNARY. It has no relation to forest bearing lands at the headwaters of navigable streams.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, it is land which is adjacent to established forest areas. Of course, some of these lands were given to many other agencies. The Biological Survey has acquired a considerable number of acres. A number of acres have been transferred to the National Park Service. But those adjacent to established forest areas were transferred to the Forest Service.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, as a member of the National Forest Reservation Commission I would like to say upon that point that all the lands that will be transferred to the Forest Service are outside of existing units. They are not within the units. They may be adjacent, and are adjacent, because attractive land far removed from any forest unit could not be very well handled by the Forest Service unless it were sufficiently large within itself to warrant the handling of the tract as a separate forest unit area. So, while the addition of these lands does increase the forests, the additional lands do not fill out units which have been commenced. In other words, the National Forest Reservation Commission, on the advice and recommendation of the Forest Service, approves a unit. The boundaries are marked out and lands are purchased within the unit. The addition of lands outside the unit may increase the total area of the unit finally, but will not make any contribution to the filling out of the area included within the unit.

We have tried to follow a somewhat consistent rule by not purchasing lands where less than 20 percent of the unit has been acquired by the Government. Generally speaking, the Commission has followed that rule during the past 2 years.

The larger part of the money paid to the Forest Service with the assistance of the Commission for establishing units throughout the country has come to us through allotments from relief or public-works appropriations. By virtue of an order issued by the President 2 years ago, I believe, some \$30,000,000 was transferred at one time.

These forest units have now been established as far west as Minnesota, and even beyond, some in California, but the greater part of the units which are now being filled out are in the eastern part of the United States. Large areas have been purchased in the State of Michigan, as well as areas in Missouri and Illinois, and, as I have stated, some have been established as far west as Minnesota.

I do not think there is any better purpose for which Congress can authorize the expenditure of public money than in the rebuilding of our forests, in the rebuilding of lands which have been denuded of timber—cut-over lands. The purchases made by the Forest Service and approved by the Commission have not evoked any complaint on account of the high prices paid; but from time to time the Commission have considered protests, coming from various and widely scattered sections of the country, that we were paying too little for the lands, and thereby affecting the general market price of other lands in the areas.

It seems to me that this program ought to be extended as far as possible, and I heartily agree that we should have a fixed appropriation of \$10,000,000 a year for the purpose of filling out the various forest units, now running very high in number.

In many of the units only 25 or 30 percent of the land within the area has been purchased, and the longer we defer action probably the higher will be the prices which will have to be paid, and certainly greater will be the delay in the actual effective work of the Forest Service in treating the whole area as a unit, and applying to it such principles and

such policies as the Forest Service desires to apply to the respective units. I hope the appropriation will be increased to \$5,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Georgia whether he will not be willing to step forward to page 80 to another amendment in which I am interested, because I am compelled to leave the Chamber?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to accommodate the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that we take up at this time the amendment in line 2 on page 80.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 80, line 2, the committee proposes to strike out "\$375,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$450,000", so as to make the paragraph read:

Tobacco Inspection Act: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of an act entitled "An act to establish and promote the use of standards of classification for tobacco, to provide and maintain an official tobacco-inspection service, and for other purposes", approved August 23, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 511-511q), \$450,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the figures "\$450,000" be eliminated and that "\$525,000" be substituted.

This is an increase in the amount of money appropriated for the purpose of scientific grading of tobacco through the Department of Agriculture. If I had the time, I should like to go into the history of the appropriation and the history of the activities of the Department of Agriculture in the matter of grading tobacco. It is a sort of self-liquidating proposition.

When I was a boy, living in the country, we used to raise tobacco, but we knew only three grades. In the scientific development of the marketing of tobacco, however, there are now some sixty-odd grades of tobacco, and the more scientifically these tobaccos are graded better prices and the more logical prices are received by the producer according to the quality of his tobacco.

Mr. President, tobacco produces about one-eighth of the entire revenue of the United States Treasury. Between \$525,000,000 and \$550,000,000 goes into the Treasury of the United States because of taxation on tobacco. That is about one-eighth of the income of the Treasury Department.

Tobacco is the only product which still bears war-time taxes levied during the World War. There is a tax of 18 cents a pound on tobacco that is distributed in the rough, or in the hand, or loose for chewing or smoking purposes, unless the farmer sells his own tobacco which he himself has produced on his own farm, and in that event he does not have to pay the tax. But if I raise tobacco and I sell it to B, and B desires to sell it to the consuming public for the purposes of chewing or smoking, without going through what is called the manufacturing process, B must pay a tax of 18 cents a pound into the Treasury of the United States in order to enjoy the right to resell that tobacco. Although that tobacco may have been sold by the farmer for 5 or 6 cents a pound, the Government of the United States gets 18 cents a pound in the form of a tax. There is the tax on cigars; there is the tax on smoking tobacco; there is the tax on cigarettes, and all these different taxes on tobacco in its various forms amount to nearly \$550,000,000 a year.

All we are asking is \$150,000 increase in the amount of money carried in the appropriation bill as passed by the House in order to assist the Department of Agriculture to help the farmers grade their tobacco more scientifically.

Under the appropriation of \$375,000 carried in the House bill, and \$450,000 carried in the bill as amended by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, there are scores of tobacco markets in the United States, in Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Wisconsin, and in the southern part of Ohio, and probably a few in

Indiana, where the Department cannot install any scientific and well-trained graders in order to teach the farmer how to grade his tobacco so that it may produce more money for the farmer, and of course produce more money for the Treasury.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LOGAN. Is it not also true that the farmers in those markets where they sell the tobacco are asking for these graders, but the Department of Agriculture cannot furnish them because of lack of funds?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is absolutely true. The tobacco growers have been imploring and are now imploring Congress to increase this appropriation. I went before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and asked for an additional \$150,000 and the committee granted an increase of \$75,000, which is really insignificant when compared to the need. The farmers' organizations, individual farmers, and the Farm Bureau Federation in all the States which produce tobacco, are asking for the increase.

Mr. President, in view of the enormous revenue that is produced and which comes into the United States Treasury from tobacco alone, \$150,000 is an insignificant sum to ask Congress to appropriate in order that the tobacco farmers may be given the necessary help in undertaking to grade scientifically their tobacco. They are asking for such help. The amount asked is small. I realize that it is the committee's duty to keep appropriations down. However, greater amounts of money are carried in the appropriation bill for the benefit of crops which do not produce a dime of revenue for the United States. I do not object to that. I am in favor of appropriating money for the benefit of all agricultural products. I am not sectional in my attitude toward agriculture, and even though the increase I ask is not allowed, I would not vote to strike from the bill any item in it the purpose of which is to help some other crop in some other section of the country. But it certainly seems to me to be a just and fair request, and one which ought not to receive opposition, when a great agricultural industry, the tobacco industry, which provides for the United States Treasury one-eighth of its income, asks for \$150,000, not only to help the farmer grade his tobacco more scientifically, and therefore receive more money for it, but almost automatically to increase the amount of money that will come into the United States Treasury by reason of the more scientific grading and marketing and distributing of the tobacco produced in the United States.

I hope the amendment to the committee amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was personally much impressed by the statement which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] made when he appeared before the Committee on Appropriations. However, the item he refers to is just one of any number of very meritorious items which the Appropriations Committee would like to include in the bill. But when considering the many requests which were made, in the light of the amount carried in the House bill, and the amount approved by the Bureau of the Budget, the committee allowed the Senator from Kentucky one-half of the amount which he requested. I might point out that this amount of \$75,000 was just that much above the Budget estimate. The Budget recommended the sum of \$375,000.

We were keenly aware of the merits of the assertions of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] in making this appropriation last year. The year before last only \$275,000 was allowed for this purpose. The Senator from Kentucky appeared before the committee and we agreed to \$450,000 last year, and the item came out of conference with \$375,000. Therefore the item for the current year is a substantial increase over the amount carried year before last.

It is true that tobacco does pay an enormous amount of revenue into the National Treasury, but when the basic act was enacted providing for this inspection work, that fact was taken into account.

This is one of the few inspection items under the Department of Agriculture for which no inspection fee is charged the farmer. In most instances some fee is charged for inspection. Of course, I am arguing against self-interest in this matter because the tobacco farmers in my State are very anxious to have these grading markets established, but my responsibility as Senator in charge of the bill compels me to oppose any increase over and above the amount we allowed.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LOGAN. The thing that is uppermost in my mind is that if the Department of Agriculture is given the additional \$150,000 it can supply the demand for grading. But if Congress stops with a \$75,000 increase, then there will be many tobacco markets in which the graders and inspection service cannot be installed. The service would be installed in the tobacco market in one town, let us say, and in another town, not far away, the Department cannot give them the same service, and they must do without it.

In view of the fact that the Department of Agriculture can furnish all the graders necessary if the \$150,000 increase is granted and will have to leave certain markets out if only \$75,000 is granted, it seems to me apparent that the \$150,000 asked for should be allowed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of course, there is some merit in that argument, but this inspection service is not installed in any tobacco market until there has been a referendum of the farmers living in the neighborhood, and the Department has proceeded very wisely and has not called referendums except when the Department has been requested so to do.

Mr. LOGAN. That is true.

Mr. RUSSELL. And the service is now being afforded where the referendums have been held and the majority of the farmers have voted in the affirmative. Other tobacco markets doubtless would have approved the establishment of this service if referendums were held, but at the present time the service is established in all the markets in which referendums have been held, and the increase which the committee allowed will permit an increase in the number of markets where the farmers can vote that they wish to have the service established.

Mr. LOGAN. The Department of Agriculture would naturally not call a referendum when it knew it did not have the money to supply the graders. I think all the farmers want this grading help if they can get it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to the committee amendment on page 80, line 2.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 50, after line 23, to insert:

For the acquisition of lands for addition to the Tahoe National Forest in the State of Nevada in accordance with the provisions of sections 1 to 4, inclusive, of the act approved February 12, 1938, \$325,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, upon a number of occasions during the past few years I have challenged attention to the fiscal policies of the Government and the unjustifiable if not illegal appropriations which were being made. I have called attention to the heavy burdens of taxation which the American people were compelled to meet and the unwise and in many instances unsound and dangerous policies which were being adopted and which called for increased appropriations and encroachments of the Federal Government upon the States. We have seen the mounting costs of Government during the past few years and the enormous increase in the demands made upon the taxpayers of the United States. All appeals for economy in governmental activities have fallen upon deaf ears. There has been a veritable orgy



of expenditures without commensurate results. It would appear that the more bureaus that were created and the larger the appropriations made by the Federal Government, the more unsatisfactory was our economic and industrial condition. Certain it is that we have not by these large expenditures reduced unemployment, improved the conditions of agriculture, and advanced the industrial and economic condition of the Nation. Indeed the demands for larger appropriations are increasing, based in part at least upon the contention that there has been no improvement in the economic or industrial conditions of our country. The opinion seems to prevail that the obligation rests upon the Federal Government to respond to every request for Federal appropriations.

There are many indications that some of our citizens are relying more and more upon the Federal Government to assume responsibilities which belong to individuals, States, and their political subdivisions. The Government is responding to many of these demands and projecting itself into fields of endeavor which are without the authority of the Federal Government.

It must be apparent to even the most casual observer of the economic and industrial conditions of the United States during the past few years that there is a subsidence of that fine spirit of individualism which is essential to the preservation of democratic institutions and of our form of government. There are limits under the Constitution to the power of the Federal Government, and whenever it transgresses such limitations unfortunate and, indeed, serious consequences will inevitably result.

I have indicated on several occasions that the Federal Government has been engaged in a spending spree, and it is obvious that the spree is not ended. But I fear that my criticisms of some of the policies of the Government have been regarded as discordant notes. I have no reason to believe that what I shall say today will meet with any very general approval in this body, and certainly not with millions who are the beneficiaries of Federal gratuities and appropriations.

We are spending billions of dollars annually in excess of the billions which we wring from the people of the United States by oppressive revenue measures. Before concluding my remarks I shall indicate some of the enormous expenditures which are being made, and the progress toward national bankruptcy which some contend we are making.

Mr. President, excessive debt, whether of individuals or of governments, may not be defended; and certainly excessive debt corrupts a nation just as it ruins individuals. As I indicated, I know that I am but a voice crying in the wilderness and that efforts to reduce governmental expenses and adopt sound fiscal policies will under the present phobia of State socialism prove futile. We cannot stay the torrential flow of Federal expenditures, notwithstanding the fact that there are signposts along the way to show that we are tending toward inflation, which will culminate in impairing the credit of the Government.

The attempt to borrow one's self out of debt only prolongs the evil and adds to the confusion. Upon many occasions I have criticized the spending policy of the Government and of my party, and have indicated that unless the demands are resisted the inevitable consequence must be bankruptcy. I have examined many of the hearings, not only those before the committee which reported the bill, but those in the House. I have examined many thousands of pages of the Senate and House hearings this year and I recall but few instances in which there was any opposition to the appropriations which were being made or to the demands which were presented by executive departments.

It is worthy of note, Mr. President, that in 99 cases out of a hundred, if not 999 out of a thousand, the demands for appropriations come from Federal officials; from these persons and Federal agencies which will profit thereby and increase their authority and power. The bureaus are always in tune to sound their demands when appropriations committees meet. The bureaus and the hundreds of thousands of Federal officials are the ones who are most anxious to obtain

appropriations. There are no opponents to question or defeat their demands; there is no devil's advocate before the committees to protect the interests of the public and of the Government. Senators may search the hearings in vain to find justification for many appropriations, or to find opposition voiced to the demands which are made.

Within a few days I shall offer a bill which I hope will have the effect of protecting the people and the Government and of providing satisfactory evidence to the legislative branches of the Government of the validity of any claim which is presented for consideration. The measure provides for an independent legislative organization or commission, with an adequate and suitable staff to investigate claims and measures presented or requests made for appropriations. This commission will have full authority to subpoena witnesses and, as indicated, to make exhaustive investigations as to the merits of any measure, or bill, or demand for legislation, and particularly for appropriations from the Federal Treasury.

Under the provisions of the proposed bill the legislative branch of the Government will not have to depend almost exclusively upon Federal agencies, Federal employees, Federal bureaus and organizations, for facts with respect to claims and demand for legislation. There will be no ex parte hearings in which only Government agencies and claimants for Federal appropriations will be heard.

Mr. President, in my opinion it would be in the interest of economy and in the interest of the people if Federal employees, and representatives of Federal bureaus and organizations, were permitted to appear before committees preparing legislation, only when requested by the proper legislative committees and organizations.

As I have indicated substantially all of the propaganda in favor of appropriations and increased activities of bureaus and Federal organizations come from employees in the Federal Government who would be profited thereby. As I have stated the hearings are practically ex parte, and committees preparing legislation are dependent almost exclusively upon representations made by Federal agencies and bureaus and by Federal employees.

Unfortunately there is great apathy upon the part of the public. Representatives of the people seldom appear, and only when they are interested in securing legislation, including appropriations. The view seems to prevail that the various departments and Federal agencies and bureaus, including the Bureau of the Budget, will prepare the necessary measures, including appropriation bills, and therefore it is not important that representatives of the public should participate in hearings leading up to the preparation of appropriation bills.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator has made an excellent suggestion in proposing an independent legislative budget and in arming senatorial debate with an independent source of information with which to combat the constant campaign for increased expenditures.

I should like to remind the Senator that the able chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], in discussing the same problem in an address this week, suggested that it might be well to require a two-thirds majority in the House and Senate to sustain appropriations. As he pointed out at the time, that was one of the provisions of the Constitution of the Confederate States.

I should like to add for the Senator's consideration, Mr. President, the further thought that the Chief Executive of this country can never fulfill his promises to the American people in respect to economy unless he has the privilege of the item veto in connection with appropriation bills. I know of nothing more essential than to give the President the item-veto privilege, so that an Executive who wants to economize may have an opportunity to do so effectively.

I submit that suggestion to the Senator.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator has indicated approval of the suggestion which I made; and I

sincerely hope that the bill which I shall present may have his support, because I fear that it will encounter opposition.

With respect to the suggestion which the Senator has made concerning the power of the President to veto items in an appropriation bill, I heartily subscribe to that view. I have favored it for a number of years, and have supported the Senator who has so eloquently and forcibly presented it from time to time for the consideration of the Senate. I marvel that we have not taken the necessary steps to effect that reform, even though a constitutional amendment might be necessary.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I merely wish to add that about 2 years ago the present President of the United States indicated a very active interest in the item veto. Since that time nothing has been heard from the White House on the subject. I do not know whether or not it has become lost in the concentrated attention which foreign affairs now demand, monopolizing every consideration we give to public matters. However, I respectfully suggest to the President of the United States that he renew his interest in his suggestion of 2 years ago. I think it would be very helpful to him, and to his successor in salvaging his deficits.

Mr. KING. I shall be pleased to see the necessary steps taken to accomplish that reform. However, Mr. President, in my opinion Senators individually and collectively do not give to the consideration of appropriation bills that serious and earnest attention which they should. We have before us today a bill calling for appropriations of more than \$1,300,000,000 in the aggregate. There were 20 Senators present before the able chairman of the subcommittee began explanation of the bill and its most important provisions; and at the conclusion of his statement less than 10 Senators were present.

It is expected that the bill will pass with but little opposition; and perhaps the lamentation will be that instead of \$1,300,000,000 the appropriation should be \$1,500,000,000.

When I was in the House, I remember that the agricultural appropriation bill carried appropriations of but a few million dollars. It now carries appropriations exceeding \$1,300,000,000, plus \$100,000,000, and perhaps more, which will be realized from customs receipts. As Senators know, a few years ago our customs receipts were between \$400,000,000 and \$600,000,000 annually. If there should be a revival of business, and a reasonable degree of prosperity, undoubtedly the customs receipts would soon rise far above the present figure, and perhaps attain a figure of \$400,000,000 or \$500,000,000 annually, which would, of course, automatically increase the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture.

The bill, of course, does not indicate the sum of over \$100,000,000 which comes from customs receipts. So when the bill passes the Department of Agriculture will have available for expenditure during the next year approximately \$1,400,000,000, a sum so large that I fear many of us do not fully comprehend.

A few moments ago we were debating over an appropriation of \$150,000 for the benefit, as it was claimed by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], of the producers of tobacco. Why not take \$150,000 from the salaries of the personnel in the Department of Agriculture and give it to the Senator from Kentucky for the benefit of tobacco growers? The personnel in the Department of Agriculture, as I recall, exceed 35,000. We could strike from the rolls thousands of those who constitute the great army in the Department of Agriculture and provide \$150,000 for the tobacco growers. However, that will not be done. The personnel will be increased by this bill. A few years ago the personnel in the Department of Agriculture was only a few thousand. In fact, I recall that when I was in the House years ago the personnel in the Department of Agriculture was approximately 1,000. I believe it is now more than 35,000. So I suggest that we economize by reducing the enormous army in the Department of Agriculture and in all the other executive departments of the Government.

There are now considerably more than a million and a half persons employed by the Federal Government not including several million whose names appear upon the pay rolls of the various Federal agencies.

As an illustration of the increase of personnel I recall that the number of employees of the Department of Commerce and Labor soon after its organization was 1,047. Later it was divided into two departments and the employees in the two departments today total many thousands. I recall that in 1903 the number of employees in the District of Columbia in the Department of Justice was 141. In 1936 there were 2,178. In the Department of the Navy the employees in the District of Columbia in 1903 were 324 and in 1936 there were 11,000. The number of employees in the Post Office Department in the District of Columbia increased from 697 in 1903 to 3,940 in 1936. The number of employees in the Department of the Interior between the years just mentioned more than doubled and in the Department of the Treasury the number of employees in 1903 in the District of Columbia was 4,881 and in 1936 there were 19,300. In June 1936, as I recall, there were employed in the civil establishment of the Government 824,259 persons. In December 1935, according to an industrial conference board estimate, there were 11,120,925 persons receiving income from the Government of the United States. In the preceding 2 years more than 9,000,000 persons were recipients of bounties and contributions from the Federal Government aside from those on the direct pay and pension rolls.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further at that point?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator's figures are very conservative as to the number of those who are now attached to the public pay roll. I have seen an authentic analysis which demonstrates that one out of every nine gainfully employed persons in the United States is on a public pay roll. We cannot sustain a Republic indefinitely upon that basis.

Mr. KING. I have seen figures given by the Senator, and, as I remember them, they are correct. May I digress for a moment to make a statement and say that the Democratic Party was builded upon the concept that this was to be a government economically administered, that the States were to take care of the functions which belonged to them under the division of authority in this dual form of government. The Democrats for years criticized the Republican Party because they claimed that it was building up a great bureaucracy, that it lacked economy in the administration of public affairs. I wonder what some Democrats who carried the banner of democracy for years would say now, when they contemplate the tremendous expansion of the Federal Government, its usurpation of the functions and duties and responsibilities of States and individuals, with its enormous appropriations which this year will exceed \$10,000,000,000, with authorizations of several billion dollars more? I may say—and I say it with regret—that I cannot understand the attitude of my party, the Democratic Party, that has always stood for economy, for the limitation of the power of the Federal Government, for the assertion of the rights of individuals and States. I cannot understand why it has abandoned those principles upon which it was founded and has accepted policies and principles of some Republican administrations. Indeed, it is said, that it has gone beyond some Republican administrations in the matter of expenditure and encroachment upon the rights of individuals and upon the authority of the States.

It is believed by many that the fundamental principles upon which the Democratic Party was founded by Jefferson have been forgotten or at least are not being followed.

May I recur to the increase in the expenditures of the Federal Government, to the demand for larger appropriations, the demand for the Federal Government to take over the functions of the States? The mail that I receive contains demands for larger appropriations and for the Government to enter into the States and take over duties and responsibilities which rest upon the counties and cities and upon the



States themselves. We seem to have lost our conception of our form of government, of its dual character, and we are moving rapidly toward a condition under which the States will lose their power, their vitality, and their strength—and there will be devolved upon the Federal Government responsibilities belonging to individuals as well as to the States. Democracy will be lost; State rights will be destroyed, and we will have a powerful paternalistic or socialistic state.

I recall that Madison stated:

The powers reserved to the several States will extend to all the objects which, in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the lives, liberties, and properties of the people and the internal order, improvement, and prosperity of the State.

I fear that we are forgetting some of the features of our form of government which commanded the admiration of students of government in other lands. Senators will recall that Lord Acton said:

Whilst England was admired for the safeguards with which, in the course of many centuries, it had fortified liberty against the power of the Crown, America appeared still more worthy of admiration for the safeguards which, in the deliberations of a single memorable year, it had set up against the power of its own sovereign people.

We should not forget that Madison, speaking for the great patriots who gave us this Republic, said that the powers delegated to the Federal Government were few and definite, but the powers remaining to State governments were numerous and indefinite. It has been said that the approach to political paternalism was paved with benevolence. The Federal Government, for at least a hundred years, did not covet authority. It merely extended a helping hand. It paid out money to the States and, indirectly, to their citizens without attaching strings to it. It left them free to work their own salvation. The fact that public generosity was a step in the substitution of collective political responsibility for personal responsibility and that it put the beneficiary in the position of paying for what the Government gave him rather than of buying what he wanted when he wanted it was not brought home until the burden of expenditure for this assistance began to be reflected in mounting taxes and increasing public debt. By giving to the States public lands and, finally, from the General Treasury the Federal Government purchased the acquiescence of the citizens and their local governments, allaying any misgivings that may have arisen.

Bills are now pending before the Congress for the Federal Government to take over the public health, to make loans to all manner of persons, and to engage in every activity incident to human life and human development, regardless of State and individual rights.

History is so clear as to the effect of excessive debts that it seems difficult to believe that a country such as ours would deliberately follow the primrose path to economic destruction. Egypt, Syria, Greece, Rome, and many other nations to which attention might be called all echo the same refrain—great expenditures, and then finally the destruction of the government through inflation and through bankruptcy.

Let me give an illustration of one of the evils following the course I have indicated. We are all familiar with New Zealand, a great democratic country. In 1880 it was an enterprising, democratic dominion, functioning under a conservative constitution akin to our own. A trade depression brought forth political leaders who would create national prosperity by different policies. A daring "borrow and scatter" government—that was its title—program was launched. The public debt was multiplied four times in as many years. The Premier, through his ability to supply more borrowed money in answer to the demand, "Where is the prosperity?" became an unchallenged dictator; economic laws were ignored; business and industrial returns declined in ratio with lavish government spending.

The court, offering some resistance to the folly, was packed. Vast loans were floated each year and all manner of pensions were granted, sapping the people of their vitality and of their independence. The Government fostered labor unions, resulting in increased wages, increased unemployment, and increased cost of living. It also resulted in a wedge between

classes, such as is being developed in the United States today and such as the Communists desire to accomplish here in this country as well as in other democratic countries. Repeating, it also resulted in a wedge between classes, which marked the end of the democracy and pointed to a later state socialism. Industry was regulated and then taken over by the Government.

We are regulating industry and fixing hours of labor; wages will soon be fixed in every department, if they are not fixed now; and, little by little, the activities which come within the category of private endeavor will come under the iron hand of a despotic bureaucracy which will presage, as I have indicated, state socialism. Our Democratic friends may think we are going to remedy the evils which have come to other nations by following the course which we are following, but they will be mistaken; and their children, if they themselves do not, will witness a change that will bring to them regret that their fathers failed to follow the principles and precepts under which this Republic was organized and established.

As I have said, in New Zealand the industry was regulated and then taken over by the Government; farmers were at first guaranteed a price, the balance being paid by the Government from taxes, as we are now giving parity-price payment to farmers; and demands will be made for similar measures dealing with those engaged in industrial activities. I make no comment upon the wisdom of it, but it is analogous to legislation which contributed to the economic downfall of the country to which I am referring.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator one more question? I do not wish to interrupt his trend of thought.

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator has been discussing the enormous appropriations which are to be domestically consumed. I read in the newspapers this morning what seems to be a commitment to \$250,000,000 which, out of a plenitude of our deficits, we are going to extend to some of our neighbors externally. Will the Senator indicate to me where the Government gets the authority, constitutionally or otherwise, to make external loans about which we read this morning in the newspapers?

Mr. KING. I am unable to answer my friend from Michigan, but I suggest that he confer with some of the advisers of the President or some of the legal luminaries whose radiance is shed upon our country today. I confess I have not enjoyed much of it.

In New Zealand high incomes were prohibited. We are going to do that by taxation. There is now pending here a bill to compel every man who has a dollar to declare it, and then he will be compelled to buy with the dollar Government bonds whether or not he wants to do so.

As stated, high incomes were prohibited in New Zealand, so that the task of paying the huge debt fell to the low-income group. The depression of 1930 brought the people abruptly face to face with their folly, but it was too late. They had become "leaners" on the Government, as we are becoming. The result was repudiation and complete socialism. If we can escape the tragic ending of New Zealand, as I have indicated, we will be more fortunate than I now anticipate. I do not think we can stop our Government upon the toboggan slide where it now finds itself in its economic, political, and industrial activities.

Mr. President, may I invite the attention of the Senate to France? Senators doubtless are more familiar with some of these historical matters than am I, but I have attempted to understand the progress of the nations and their rise and fall and the cause of their decadence and destruction.

At the end of the eighteenth century, as Senators know, France was in dire financial embarrassment. Despite thoughtful warnings, paper money inflation was adopted as the way out. We are adopting paper money; we have issued bonds to the extent of \$44,000,000,000; and a short time ago a demand was made by an important element in the administration that we should be permitted to issue \$75,000,000,000 of bonds. The bonds are largely unloaded upon the banks;

and if my friend from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], who will pardon me for addressing him, has \$10,000 in a bank in his State, if he should seek to withdraw \$10,000 he would not receive gold or silver, but would receive Government obligations, predicated upon bonds which had been unloaded upon his bank, or perhaps upon some other bank.

Mr. President, in spite of all the paper issues in France, it has been said that business activities grew more and more spasmodic. Enterprise was soon chilled, and stagnation followed. There had come a complete uncertainty as to the future, as there is today a complete uncertainty as to the future of our fiscal policy and the future of our taxation and revenue system. The result was that capitalists declined to embark their means in business. That is the case here. Enterprise received a mortal blow. Demand for labor was still further diminished. This state of things, too, while it bore heavily upon the interests of the moneyed classes, was still more ruinous to those in most moderate, and most of all to those in straitened circumstances. Private property rights gave way to frantic attempts of the Government to regulate the value of the paper money. We regulated the value of our money. We compelled men who had gold to surrender it to the Treasury. Then we "revalued," as it was termed, the gold, and made an ounce of gold which was worth \$20 plus, worth \$35. You may call that high financing, or give to it any term you please, but it was not—so some stated—an honest transaction.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I have been detained outside the Chamber; and just as I came in I heard the Senator say that we might call a certain transaction high financing, or anything else we pleased, but it was not honest.

Mr. KING. I meant to say, some persons contended that it was not an honest policy.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not understand that there has ever been any high financing except that which was honest; has there? How can the Senator apply those two terms to the transaction?

Mr. KING. My dear friend always speaks with so much irony, and his questions carry so much condemnation, that I am very often disposed to agree with him.

To cure a disease temporary in its character, a corrosive poison was administered which ate out the vitals of French prosperity. It progressed according to a law in social physics which we may call the law of accelerating issue and depreciation. It brought to commerce, manufacturing, mercantile, and agricultural interests utter ruin. It ended in the complete financial, moral, and political prostration of France.

There is a lesson in all this which it behooves thinking persons to ponder. Whether individual or nation, debt leads slowly and insidiously to disaster.

Now, let us look at our own country. What is our economic status? Wither are we tending? The table of our Federal public debt presents a picture which, repeating the language I used a moment ago, it behooves every thinking man to ponder.

I shall go back no further than 1910. In that year the public debt was \$1,147,000,000.

In 1911 it was \$1,154,000,000.

In 1912 it was \$1,194,000,000.

In 1913 it was \$1,193,000,000.

In 1914 it was \$1,188,000,000.

In 1915 it was \$1,191,000,000.

In 1916 it was \$1,225,000,000.

In 1917, as Senators know, we entered the World War and, of course, that compelled large appropriations for preparation and to carry out what we conceived to be our obligation as one of the belligerents in that frightful contest; so in 1917 the public debt was \$2,976,000,000.

In 1918 it was \$12,244,000,000. We were building ships. We were marshaling nearly 4,000,000 of our boys under the colors, and transporting to France more than 2,000,000 men. We were also making loans to our Allies of billions of dollars in order to enable them to purchase supplies from us, wheat

and other commodities, powder and shot and shell and munitions in very large quantities. So, as stated, in 1918 the debt rose to the stupendous height of \$12,244,000,000.

In 1919 pay day was coming. Some of the bonds were maturing. Some of the obligations we had incurred demanded consideration, and so the debt mounted to \$25,482,000,000.

In 1920 we reduced the debt more than a billion dollars, so that it amounted to but \$24,298,000,000.

In 1921 we reduced the debt again nearly a billion dollars, down to \$23,964,000,000.

In 1922 it was \$22,964,000,000.

The following year, 1923, it was \$22,350,000,000.

In 1924 it was \$21,251,000,000. We were reducing the debt by the very heavy burdens of taxation which we were imposing upon the American people, and were on the way to a balanced Budget within a reasonable time.

In 1925 the debt was \$20,516,000,000.

In 1926 it was \$19,643,000,000.

In 1927 it was \$18,510,000,000.

In 1928 it was \$17,604,000,000.

In 1929 it was \$16,931,000,000.

In 1930 it was \$16,185,000,000.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. DOWNEY. Am I to understand, then, that we were reducing the national debt when the depression came?

Mr. KING. I have given the figures, which indicate that issue. The Senator from California may determine for himself the implications to be derived therefrom. I have stated that we reduced the debt from the figure I have indicated so that in 1929 it was \$16,931,000,000; in 1930 it was \$16,185,000,000; in 1931 it was \$16,801,000,000; and in 1932 it was \$19,487,000,000. It had increased from 1931 to 1932 to \$19,487,000,000.

In 1933 it was \$22,539,000,000.

In 1934 it was \$27,053,000,000—a rising scale again.

In 1935 it was \$28,701,000,000.

In 1936 it was \$33,545,000,000.

In 1937 it was \$36,427,000,000.

In 1938 it was \$37,167,487,000.

In 1939 it is estimated at \$41,131,502,000.

In 1940 it is estimated at \$44,457,847,210.

As I have indicated, Mr. President, in my opinion our appropriations for the coming fiscal year will be at least one billion and I think probably two billion dollars more than they were for the current fiscal year, which will make, at the close of next year, unless there should be a tremendous renaissance in our business activity, an indebtedness of \$50,000,000,000; and we shall incur deficits, probably in violation of the terms of statutes, which we shall feel in honor bound to meet by increasing the taxes or lifting the ceiling, which is now \$50,000,000,000, for the issuing of bonds.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLMAN. I have listened with tremendous interest and agreement to the remarks of the Senator from Utah. My only comment is that with my fellow Senators on the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, which considered the agricultural appropriation bill, we do not want this one bill, the farmers' bill, to be the one in which drastic cuts must be made.

Mr. KING. May I interrupt my friend?

Mr. HOLMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KING. My observations are general in character and not directed to any particular measure.

Mr. HOLMAN. I understand that.

Mr. KING. I am directing my remarks generally to our philosophy and to our policy.

Mr. HOLMAN. I understand the Senator, and I am in entire agreement with him.

Mr. KING. If money is to be expended, I would rather to spend it for the farmers than for many other activities.

Mr. HOLMAN. I believe the way out is the way the Senator has suggested, that all the various measures asking for appropriations be scrutinized by a staff organized for that



purpose, as suggested by the Senator from Utah, the Senator from Georgia, and the Senator from Colorado.

At this point, substantiating the Senator's remark as to what happens in history to those who give way to selfish demands, I should like to have permission to read a short poem of four stanzas, composed by an Oregonian.

Mr. KING. I have no objection.

Mr. HOLMAN. The poem reads:

THE WITNESS OF THE DUST

Voices are crying from the dust of Tyre,  
From Baalbec and the stones of Babylon—  
"We raised our pillars upon self-desire,  
And perished from the large gaze of the sun."

Eternity was on the pyramids,  
And immortality on Greece and Rome;  
But in them all the ancient traitor hid,  
And so they tottered like unstable foam.

There was no substance to their soaring hopes;  
The voice of Thebes is now a desert cry;  
A spider bars the road with filmy ropes,  
Where once the feet of Carthage thundered by.

No house can stand, no kingdom can endure,  
Built on the crumbling rock of self-desire;  
Nothing is Living Stone, nothing is sure,  
That is not whitened in the social fire.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think the poem the Senator has read came from a person who was familiar with history and the deductions which are to be drawn from infractions of moral and spiritual laws, as well as sound financial policies.

I might add, supplementing the observations of the Senator, that governments are not immune to the evil results which follow the transgression of moral and spiritual laws. Men who violate those laws perish miserably. Nations which violate the laws of God and the laws of justice and humanity will perish. The history of the world is a record of the struggles of individuals for liberty and justice, their ascent to a high degree of civilization, then, by corruption, they lost the proud eminence which they had achieved and went down to destruction.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I have not been in the Chamber during all of the Senator's references to the question which he has been discussing, but the remarks of the Senator from Oregon make me believe that perhaps I lost the principal part of the address. Has the Senator proposed setting up some supercommittee to coordinate all appropriation bills, and things of that sort?

Mr. KING. I shall be glad very briefly to respond to the Senator. What I suggested was that we have an executive budget organization, speaking primarily for the executive department. I hope I will be pardoned a personal allusion. The late Senator of Illinois was chairman of a committee considering that matter, and I had the honor to serve with him. We worked for months attempting to devise a budget system which I hoped would tend to reduce the expenditures of the Government, and coordinate the expenditures in the various departments. I think we failed in accomplishing all that was desired. What I stated, supplementing that, was that Congress does not have a budget commission, does not have organizations to scrutinize appropriations. The Committees on Appropriations meet, and in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred every person who comes before the committees is interested in getting something out of the Treasury.

We do not have a devil's advocate there. We do not have anyone to defend the Government. Senators, with their multitudinous duties on various committees, can only accept the testimony that is presented, with the limited opportunities afforded them of securing evidence corroborative, or evidence to negative and overcome the testimony which has been given.

I suggested, therefore, that we should have an independent legislative organization to look into the various demands being made, and to make independent investigations, that we give it a staff to secure evidence and the facts as to the matters under consideration. The legislative commission,

under the plan suggested, would get experts from outside of the Government service, persons who are familiar with governmental and social questions, and with the problems which Congress has to meet. The commission would be advisory to the House and the Senate, and would sit in with the committees and present the facts which they have elicited.

Mr. HATCH. There would be no intention on the part of the Senator, then, that the advisory committee supersede or take the place of the regular committees of Congress?

Mr. KING. Oh, no.

Mr. HATCH. Its function would be to furnish information?

Mr. KING. Yes. The Senator has been a very able judge, and he knows it is not satisfactory to rely only upon ex parte testimony. Frequently, where no preparation has been made by a defendant, the case goes against him by default, whereas if all the facts had been obtained, a different judgment might have been rendered by the jury or by the court.

All I am suggesting is that Congress get the facts and not rely solely upon special interests, upon people who are in the Government service and who want large appropriations or who desire to expand their functions of the organizations with which they are connected.

We know the tendency of bureaus to proliferate. There is a greater fecundity in Government agencies and Government organizations than there is in any branch of the animal kingdom.

Mr. President, I have been diverted by the poem read by the Senator from Oregon and I am sure he should congratulate the writer of the same.

Mr. HOLMAN. The author was Edwin Markham.

Mr. KING. Anything which comes from the pen and brain of Edwin Markham is a benediction, and calls for thought upon the part of those who read.

Mr. President, the figures which I have read of the mounting indebtedness of the Government, up to more than \$44,457,847,000 are so huge as to stagger comprehension. I wonder if we understand what a billion dollars means? Yet I notice in the first amendment that we are asked to increase the salaries in one small branch up to nearly a million dollars, where it ought to have been only perhaps \$25,000 to \$100,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Senator from Utah is in error as to the bill providing any increase in salaries in any such amount.

Mr. KING. It is an increase for the department here in Washington, and I assumed it referred to compensation.

Mr. RUSSELL. The total amount in the item referred to by the Senator is only \$24,000.

Mr. KING. That is not the one to which I refer.

Mr. RUSSELL. The appropriations in the bill are large enough, without exaggerating the amounts.

Mr. KING. There is an increase of \$600,000 plus for salaries in one of the agencies here.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no such item in the bill. The office of Budget and Finance does have an increase of \$8,800.

Mr. KING. That is not the one to which I refer, and I am sure if the Senator will look at the bill he will find the one I am discussing. When I conclude my remarks, I shall point it out.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have been living with the bill for several weeks, and I am sure there is no such increase in salaries. There are increases in appropriations, but there is no such increase in salaries.

Mr. KING. Perhaps I was in error in saying it was for salaries, but it was for one of the agencies in the District of Columbia, and for services in the District of Columbia, and I cannot conceive that it could be for anything else—because they get their rent free—except for salaries.

I indicated that many do not understand what a billion dollars is. Let me give some idea of what it means. There are in the District approximately 600,000 people, plus. If every man, woman, and child in Washington came forward

and deposited a dollar each day it would take 2 days to accumulate a million dollars. They would have to deposit a dollar each day for 2,000 days, approximately 6 years, in order to accumulate a billion dollars. It would require 270 years to accumulate \$45,000,000,000. Every man, woman, and child in the District of Columbia would have to deposit a dollar a day for approximately 270 years in order to pay the principal alone of the public debt. Assuming a man lived to be 60, it would take four and a half lives of that duration.

Then there is the interest on the public debt. At 2 percent, the interest alone amounts to nearly \$1,000,000,000 a year. Eight dollars for every person in the United States would be required to pay only the interest on the public debt for 1 year.

There is a disturbing factor in the increase portrayed by the table, in addition to the mere size of the figures. Since 1930 the debt has been higher each year than in the preceding year. From 16 to 19, 22, 27, 28, 33, 36, 37, 41, 44, and so on. For 10 years now, without a single exception, Government expenditures have greatly exceeded Government receipts. On the other hand, the expansion in the debt necessitated by the war emergency, from \$3,000,000,000 in 1917 to \$25,500,000,000 in 1919, was immediately checked when the emergency had passed. The debt was lowered each year, without exception, between 1919 and 1930.

I digress for a personal allusion. I am a member of the Finance Committee and I am receiving letters daily from all parts of the United States protesting against increasing the Federal taxes. Complaints are made that bankruptcy is being forced upon the small-business men as well as others in various industrial and business activities, and upon private individuals, by reason of the enormous taxes which are wrung from the people by the oppressive Federal legislation.

I desire to reduce the taxes, but we will increase them, and if we do not increase the taxes but continue the enormous expenditures, undoubtedly the day will come when the bonds of the Government will react to the situation, thus forced upon the country. If they should fall a few points, it can be imagined what the result would be. Banks and insurance companies might experience some concern. It is a fact that 60,000,000 Americans hold insurance policies. Millions of American people, particularly women, are investing their savings in annuities with insurance companies, and the insurance companies are taking the payments which are made and obtaining Government bonds. Suppose that the policy of spending is continued; it might eventuate in inflation. This would result in an unfortunate situation.

Mr. President, do the figures mean that the emergency of 1930 is still with us, or has there been a fundamental change in the conception of government which will require the huge expenditures as the rule rather than the exception?

I find no movement here among members of my own party, and not a suspicious movement by my brethren on the other side of the aisle in favor of the reduction of Government expenditures.

I should like to see a group of Senators and a group of Representatives work together for the purpose of demanding a reduction in Federal expenditures so that we may not be compelled before the Congress adjourns or at the next session of Congress, to increase the burdens of taxation which are now bearing so oppressively upon business, upon the big-business man and the little-business man, upon private individuals as well as upon partnerships and corporations. But I find no voices raised demanding reduction in expenditures. The demand is "Give. Give more." And in Washington today I venture that there are many representatives of States, counties, and municipalities for the purpose of obtaining appropriations from the Federal Government, or securing grants which call of course for increased taxes, and which stimulate in other sections of the country demands for excessive grants and payments out of the Federal Treasury for activities which belong to the municipalities and the counties and the State and individuals. I fear we have lost all sense of proportion.

The Federal Government no longer is a federal government. It is a national government with a big "N." It is

increasing its power and encroaching upon the rights of individuals, and thus destroying the initiative of the American people.

It is a strange philosophy that government debt can be differentiated from the debt of an individual. Of course, it is to be differentiated only because it is more danger, and in the long run has potentialities for evil far in excess of those which hover over the individual in his greatest problems.

There is no magic, Mr. President, in government borrowing and spending. I have said before that this is the spendiest Nation in the world. This is the spendiest administration that our country has ever seen.

The debt must be paid, and with money. Of course, it may be deflated money. Will the Senate pardon a personal allusion? I was in Germany under the period of deflation, and I saw working people, when they got their marks at night, run as fast as possible to the nearest store to buy anything to get rid of their marks, because before morning they would lose in value perhaps several hundred percent.

Taxes now yield more than \$5,000,000,000 to the Government annually. Thirty years ago less than \$1,000,000,000 was collected in taxes, and this revenue was sufficient to pay the operating expenses and to reduce the public debt. Now, with the taxes increased more than five times—and under this administration—expenditures have gone up nearly 1,000 percent. The debt is 40 times as large today as it was 30 years ago. That is because the Government receipts have increased only five times, whereas expenditures are today approximately 15 times as much as they were in 1910. And we will increase the expenditures before we adjourn, and with increased public indebtedness we will have a larger deficit next year than we have this year, and so on until ultimately, if the people are not aroused, there will be national bankruptcy. It is inevitable. Bankruptcy in the sense that Germany had it; bankruptcy in the sense that Russia had it. When a mark was less than one-hundredth part of a cent, and when a ruble—and I found that was the case—had no value.

When I was in Moscow a few years ago the little children in the street were taking the paper rubles and making spitballs out of them, which they flung at each other in the streets.

Mr. President, an individual could not long operate upon such a financial basis. How long may a government?

The deficit trend must be reversed and this alarming debt reduced or repudiation and cancellation through inflation is inevitable, with all its chaos and tragedy. It has been well said:

All of us are committed to the proposition that the worthy needy must be taken care of, but at the same time, it must not be forgotten that the destruction of savings and the starvation of production through an ever-increasing deficit and public debt means that there will be a loss of the capacity to care for the needy. The thrifty citizen, and not the Government, must produce the money for this purpose. Necessarily, the interests of those on relief are identical with the interests of the producers and those who have saved, for the Government cannot care for the needy one moment longer than it remains within the capacity of the thrifty in America to provide the Government with necessary funds.

The masses of the people in America have been misled into the belief that the debt caused by public spending is to be paid by the rich. Let us look at the facts. In 1936, 61 individuals, with incomes of a million or more, paid \$107,000,000 in income tax. The Government took all but thirty million, leaving these 61 persons only 29 percent of their income. A government that spends eight billions a year spends more than \$21,000,000 each day. If the Government had taken the thirty million from the rich that it did not take, it could have operated on this sum for only 1½ days. Of the persons with less than \$5,000 income, aggregating five and one-half billion, only 1.2 percent was taken as income tax, or sixty-six million. Who, in the end, is going to pay this public debt—the rich, who are already deprived of 71 percent of their income, or the poor, who now pay a little more than 1 percent?

The answer is obvious, and the reason they are not protesting against the extravagant spending is that they do not real-



ize that they are the ones who will have to pay in the end. If all the property of the rich is taken, then obviously the burden of taxation must rest, as it now does, upon the wage earner and those of limited resources.

The trouble is that the American people are not tax-conscious. In 1936 only 3,000,000 out of 40,000,000 gainfully employed persons paid any tax on income. The persons upon whom the burden will lie are at present enjoying a short immunity. It would be well if we were conscious of the plight which awaits the American people if this extravagance continues.

Where are the blessings which were to follow Government spending? The New York Sun, in its Voice of Business issue for January 7, presents an interesting comparison. I do not endorse all the statement, but it is worthy of consideration as showing the thought which prevails in some parts of our country.

The population of the United States is 130,000,000. The population of the United Kingdom, which we shall call England, is 45,000,000. Therefore, on a population basis the national income of the United States should be three times that of England. In 1929 it was four times that of England. In 1937 it was only two and two-fifths times that of England. From the low point of the depression, 1932, England's national income had increased 101 percent at the end of 1937. The national income of the United States, from the low of 1933, had increased only 49 percent at the 1937 high. National tax receipts in England have increased 11 percent since 1932. In the United States they have increased 193 percent.

England did not attempt to spend itself out of the depression. From 1932 to 1938 the British budget shows a surplus of about \$400,000,000, which means that that sum was the amount of tax revenues which remained after Government spending. The United States did attempt to spend itself out of the depression. From 1932 to 1938 the United States Budget showed a deficit of \$20,400,000,000, which means that that sum was the amount of money spent over the revenue which was collected by the Federal Government.

Mr. President, it is to be hoped that the American citizenry will soon ask, "Where is the prosperity?" The answer to that question will determine whether this Nation will continue as a democracy, or whether it will follow the course of New Zealand, where the answer was more spending, culminating in state socialism.

It must be remembered that the Government has no money of its own. Yesterday I received a letter with a demand for more money. In answer to my reply to the first inquiry, I stated that the Government did not have the money, that we were in debt, and spending more than we were collecting. My correspondent was amazed. He thought the Government had an abundance of money, and could meet all demands made by the people. That illustration shows that we are not tax-conscious. It shows that many of our American people do not understand the question of Federal finance, or the relation of individuals, States, and counties to the Federal Government.

Every cent the Government spends must come from the people. Taxes fundamentally depend upon the exchange of articles or services. Capital is essential for the functioning of both governments and individuals. Without it services will not be rendered, or articles or commodities produced. It seems to me that we need some lessons from Adam Smith, from Ricardo, and from the great writers upon political economy and upon a sound economic system. The experience of countries all down the pages of history, and the experience of the United States during the past few years, testify to the general principle that capital is dormant in the face of uncertainty, in the threat of overpowering debt and imminent bankruptcy. Excessive bank reserves in America today are illustrative of the unhealthy status of our national economy. A few moments ago I presented the picture of the national debt. To make the figure complete, and to illustrate its growth year by year, the table of our national receipts and expenditures will indicate the current tendency toward deficits, despite the marked increase in revenue.

I hope the Senate will pardon me for inviting attention to the figures of receipts and expenditures. Figures always give us headaches. They are not always very illuminating. In stating the figures, I shall give only the round numbers.

In 1910 the receipts were \$899,000,000, or less than \$1,000,000,000. The expenditures were \$673,000,000; and the surplus \$206,000,000.

In 1911 the receipts were a little more than \$900,000,000; the expenditures only \$600,000,000; and the surplus \$248,000,000 plus.

In 1912 the receipts were \$939,000,000; expenditures, \$689,000,000; surplus, \$249,000,000.

In 1913 the receipts were \$990,000,000; expenditures, \$724,000,000; surplus, \$266,000,000.

In 1914 the receipts were \$1,018,000,000; expenditures, \$700,000,000; surplus, \$283,000,000.

In 1915 the receipts were \$900,000,000; expenditures, \$700,000,000; surplus, \$220,000,000.

In 1916 the receipts were \$1,094,000,000; expenditures, \$734,000,000; surplus, \$360,000,000.

In 1917, the receipts were \$1,448,000,000; expenditures, \$1,977,000,000; and that year, during the war, we had a deficit of \$528,000,000.

In 1918 the receipts were \$3,000,000,000; expenditures, \$12,000,000,000; deficit, \$8,000,000,000.

In 1919 the receipts were \$5,000,000,000, expenditures \$18,000,000,000; closing out the expenditures of the war with a deficit of \$13,000,000,000.

In 1920, the receipts were \$7,000,000,000, expenditures \$6,000,000,000; and we had a surplus in 1920 of \$644,000,000.

In 1921 we reduced taxes down to \$6,000,000,000. Expenditures were only \$5,000,000,000, and we had a surplus of more than \$550,000,000, which was applied to the extinguishment of the public debt.

Without taking the time to read all these figures, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

*Receipts and expenditures of the Federal Government*

Year	Receipts	Expenditures	Surplus	Deficit
1910	\$899,640,373	\$693,617,065	\$206,023,308	
1911	939,712,735	691,201,512	248,511,223	
1912	939,353,220	689,881,334	249,471,886	
1913	990,730,756	724,511,963	266,218,793	
1914	1,018,807,733	735,081,431	283,726,302	
1915	981,658,992	760,586,802	221,072,190	
1916	1,094,592,237	734,055,202	360,536,035	
1917	1,448,850,911	1,977,681,751		\$528,830,840
1918	3,990,428,126	12,697,836,705		8,707,408,579
1919	5,427,198,262	18,522,894,705		13,095,696,443
1920	7,126,502,601	6,482,090,191	644,412,410	
1921	6,088,424,236	5,538,209,190	550,215,046	
1922	4,593,876,188	3,795,302,500	798,573,688	
1923	4,539,963,406	3,697,478,020	842,485,386	
1924	4,584,968,480	3,506,677,715	1,078,290,765	
1925	4,379,740,162	3,529,643,446	850,096,716	
1926	4,622,575,491	3,584,584,519	1,037,990,972	
1927	4,812,516,430	3,493,584,519	1,318,931,911	
1928	4,735,982,077	3,643,519,875	1,092,462,202	
1929	4,730,197,803	3,848,463,190	881,734,613	
1930	4,883,425,800	3,994,152,487	889,273,313	
1931	3,846,102,015	4,091,597,712		245,495,697
1932	2,593,897,360	5,153,644,895		2,559,747,535
1933	2,667,328,106	5,142,953,627		2,475,625,521
1934	3,702,287,216	7,105,050,085		3,402,762,869
1935	4,431,262,504	7,375,825,166		2,944,562,662
1936	4,781,299,971	8,879,798,258		4,098,498,287
1937	6,020,041,347	8,105,158,547		2,085,117,200
1938	6,241,661,227	7,691,287,108		1,449,625,881
1939 <sup>1</sup>	5,520,070,000	9,492,320,000		3,972,250,000
1940 <sup>1</sup>	5,669,320,000	8,965,663,200		3,296,343,000

<sup>1</sup> Estimates from the Budget.

Figures as to expenses and receipts are taken from the Report of the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1938.

Mr. KING. I will come down to the last 2 or 3 years, to show the change. In 1931 receipts were \$4,883,000,000, expenditures were \$3,994,000,000, and the surplus was \$889,000,000.

In 1932 the receipts were \$3,000,000,000 plus, expenditures \$4,000,000,000 plus, and the deficit was \$245,000,000.

The deficits have been increasing until 1940, when they will be more than \$3,336,000,000. Although taxes are \$5,669,000,000, our appropriations are practically \$9,000,000,000. We increased taxes from \$1,000,000,000, as they were a few years ago, to \$5,669,000,000, and expenditures from the

amount which I have indicated to approximately \$9,000,000,000 in 1939, and \$9,000,000,000 in 1940, with deficits in 1939 of nearly \$4,000,000,000, and in 1940, in my opinion, in excess of that amount.

Mr. President, one of the more unfortunate aspects of the Government embarking upon a program of this character is the fact that once inaugurated it is difficult, if not impossible, to stop. I now make the prediction, Mr. President, that we cannot stop, or will not stop, the spending program until, as I have indicated, we reach the dead line, beyond which will be impairment of national credit, if not insolvency.

It takes no argument to show that a person cannot receive something for nothing, but must work for that which he receives. The so-called emergency appropriations and the continued demand for them are unhappy evidences of the truth of this statement. The emergency appropriations for relief since 1933 are as follows:

For farm aid, we started in 1933 with an appropriation of \$84,000,000 plus. The appropriation was increased right along until 1938, when it was \$531,000,000.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the entire table from which I am reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

FARM AID	
1933	\$84,239,397
1934	865,879,718
1935	870,491,921
1936	699,584,331
1937	580,018,608
1938	531,566,500
CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS	
1934	\$331,940,851
1935	435,508,643
1936	486,281,193
1937	385,807,729
1938	323,332,547
RELIEF	
1933	\$37,910,142
1934	1,512,483,723
1935	1,906,230,820
1936	489,150,631
1937	13,174,236
1938	4,593,654
PUBLIC WORKS	
1934	\$642,432,350
1935	1,020,411,840
1936	2,092,069,806
1937	2,639,373,388
1938	1,814,950,939
HOME OWNERS' AID	
1933	\$43,970,000
1934	194,930,031
1935	103,554,093
1936	214,312,369
1937	297,856,350
1938	239,566,247
MISCELLANEOUS	
1933	\$1,110,918,629
1934	735,648,775
1935	46,526,621
1936	24,692,828
1937	4,873
1938	7,149,006
TOTAL EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS	
1933	\$1,277,038,168
1934	4,233,315,453
1935	4,247,339,007
1936	3,805,683,412
1937	3,916,235,236
1938	2,236,167,039

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the impossibility of cutting out so-called emergency spending is indicated by the cry that went up all over the country when the Congress voted to cut the W. P. A. appropriation in January by one hundred and fifty million. It was claimed, and accurately, that the cut would bring misery and misfortune to many. Of course, those receiving gratuities from the Government will suffer if they are taken away. No one doubts that to be so; but that suffering is to be considered in view of the evil which ultimately will result if we continue to travel along the road that leads to

bankruptcy and chaos. An individual who cuts his standard of living in order to pay his debts is deprived of many things; he does not enjoy many of the things to which he has been accustomed; and similar deprivation must be faced by a government if it will heed the warning of nature's law of economics.

#### FEDERAL BUREAUS AND PERSONNEL

One of the factors commonly ascribed to the downfall of the great Roman Empire is the vast army of officials and employees of the government which marched in and out among the people, eating out their very livelihood. The personnel of a government that becomes predominantly administrative is of necessity staggering. It has already been stated that in New Zealand more than one-third of the population was dependent upon the government under their state socialistic plan.

Senators need not be reminded of the number of administrative agencies that have been created in our country—quasi judicial, and quasi legislative. More and more, the judicial functions are being transferred from the courts to other bodies. Legislative functions are devolved upon executive officials under the pretense that Congress is incapable of legislating upon the complicated problems of today. Each agency is clothed with the rule-making power—prescribing regulations for the future—an inherently legislative function.

The fate of Rome is a poignant warning, if only we would heed, and check this destructive tendency toward administrative government. The Romans enjoyed a highly developed system of legal jurisprudence, administered by independent tribunals—the praetors and the iudexes. Slowly, and over the course of centuries, the emperor usurped the prerogatives of the praetor. The iudex was dispensed with, and, beginning with the reign of Diocletian, the judicial power was completely in the hands of the emperor, and was exercised under him by administrative officers and through administrative procedure.

The Roman Senate followed the same course. During the republic it enacted the laws. In time the Emperor submitted legislation to the senate for consideration, then "must" legislation, and then gradually and without realization came the change—the mere reading of the Emperor's suggested legislation before the senate gave it the force of law. The senate, of course, was not needed further. It was not long after the Emperor had control of all power—executive, legislative, and judicial—that the Romans lost their liberties, and not long thereafter the great Empire fell prey to invading tribes.

What of our own country? Are we immune to the inexorable laws of nature? Are we not intelligent enough to read from the pages of history the lessons that are there to guide us? The fathers, in founding this Republic, gave deep thought to the plight that had overtaken previous nations and attempted to safeguard theirs from the causes which commonly had led to disaster. Today, when the theory of government is being changed in so many lands—with consequent loss of civil rights—and when our own Government is rapidly approaching the pitfalls to guard against which our Constitution was adopted, it is regrettable that little thought is given to the causes that brought about the downfall of other nations.

What are the facts? The need for last year's Government reorganization bill lay in the fact that, according to the majority report, there were 133 distinct agencies and bureaus. It was stated that 13 different agencies of the Government were engaged in the map-making business. There are 10 major executive departments; the Civil Service Commission lists 48 independent establishments; and if every bureau and division in every department is counted, the figure is in the hundreds. The Congressional Directory lists some 185 different divisions, boards, agencies, and bureaus.

As an inevitable result of our vast bureaucracy, we have an army of persons working for the Government today.

On December 31, 1938, there were 5,351,749 persons upon the Federal pay roll. This does not include the vast numbers that depend upon the Government in the form of pen-



sions, old-age insurance, and so forth. In other words, excluding pension receivers, nearly one-eighth of the gainfully employed were paid by the Government from taxes which it collected from those engaged in productive activities, or paid by borrowing from the people or by creating deficits which call for the issuance of bonds.

The figures, except as otherwise specified, are of December 31, 1938, and, I may say, that I obtained these figures from the Government records.

I have a table here showing the classification of the 5,351,749 on the pay rolls. Mr. President, may I insert it in the RECORD without taking the time to read it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the table will be printed in the RECORD.

The table referred to is as follows:

1. Office of the President.....	45
2. The 10 executive departments.....	754,645
3. Independent establishments.....	162,613
4. Legislative branch of the Government.....	5,145
5. Judicial branch of the Government.....	2,271
6. War Department, total officers.....	13,435
7. War Department, total enlisted men.....	173,127
8. Navy Department, <sup>1</sup> total officers.....	10,151
9. Navy Department, <sup>1</sup> total enlisted men.....	110,252
10. Marine Corps, total officers.....	1,358
11. Marine Corps, total enlisted men.....	17,546
12. Coast Guard, <sup>2</sup> total officers.....	1,201
13. Coast Guard, <sup>2</sup> total enlisted men.....	8,881
14. C. C. C., enrollees and officers.....	269,020
15. N. Y. A. (student-aid program).....	368,921
16. N. Y. A. (works program).....	239,627
17. Works Progress Administration <sup>3</sup> .....	3,213,510
Total.....	5,351,749

<sup>1</sup> As of Feb. 1, 1939.

<sup>2</sup> As of June 30, 1938.

<sup>3</sup> As of week ending Nov. 26, 1938.

Mr. KING. In other words, the total Federal employees may be classified as follows:

Executive, legislative, judicial, and administrative.....	924,719
National defense.....	335,952
C. C. C. and N. Y. A.....	877,568
W. P. A.....	3,213,510
Total.....	5,351,749

Mr. KING. The astounding number of persons employed in our vast bureaucracy presents a discouraging picture. They are not engaged in productive activities. They do not create national wealth or national income. They do not produce the goods that are essential to a recovery of prosperity. The number in each particular agency is inconceivable.

Mr. President, I have here as an exhibit a list of the civil employees in the 10 executive departments and in the office of the President as of December 1938, the regular force account and works program indicating, as I have said, more than 5,000,000.

I ask that this exhibit be inserted in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the exhibit will be inserted in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

**I. Civil employees in the 10 executive departments and in the office of the President, as of December 1938**

	Regular	Force account <sup>1</sup>	Works program	Total
Office of the President.....	45			45
Executive departments:				
State.....	4,973	714	5	5,692
Treasury.....	58,407	222	9,843	68,472
War.....	65,754	35,134	529	101,417
Justice.....	8,628		349	8,977
Post Office.....	344,301			344,301
Navy.....	44,301	31,352	225	75,878
Interior.....	34,548	9,566	1,885	45,999
Agriculture.....	65,558	2,365	14,917	82,840
Commerce.....	13,125	1,209	335	14,669
Labor.....	5,564		836	6,400
Total, office of the President and executive departments.....	645,204	80,562	28,924	754,690

<sup>1</sup> "Force account" are persons employed directly by the Federal Government on construction projects, such as building, naval vessel, or road construction.

Mr. KING. I have here a list of the civil employees of 48 independent establishments as of December 31, 1938. I ask to have those inserted in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the list will be printed in the RECORD.

The list referred to is as follows:

**II. Civil employees in 48 independent establishments as of December 1938**

	Regular	Force account	Works program	Total
Alley Dwelling Authority.....	19			19
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	87			87
Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System.....	416			416
Board of Tax Appeals.....	127			127
Central Statistical Board.....	39			39
Civil Aeronautics Authority.....	3,379	110	71	3,560
Civil Service Commission.....	1,568			1,568
Civilian Conservation Corps (Director's office).....	68			68
Commodity Credit Corporation.....	171			171
Electric Home and Farm Authority.....	130			130
Employees' Compensation Commission.....	508			508
Export-Import Bank.....	13			13
Farm Credit Administration.....	3,301			3,301
Federal Communications Commission.....	602			602
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	938			938
Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works.....	8,970			8,970
Federal Home Loan Bank Board.....	336			336
Federal Housing Administration.....	4,523			4,523
Federal Power Commission.....	565			565
Federal Savings & Loan Insurance Corporation.....	42			42
Federal Trade Commission.....	660			660
General Accounting Office.....	2,298		2,437	4,735
Golden Gate International Exposition Commission.....	23			23
Government Printing Office.....	5,540			5,540
Home Owners' Loan Corporation.....	11,545			11,545
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	2,454			2,454
Maritime Commission.....	1,224	119		1,343
Maritime Labor Board.....	18			18
National Advisory Commission for Aeronautics.....	500	5		505
National Archives.....	344			344
National Capital Park and Planning Commission.....	23			23
National Emergency Council.....			316	316
National Labor Relations Board.....	766			766
National Mediation Board.....	71			71
National Resources Committee.....			198	198
New York World's Fair Commission.....	20			20
Panama Canal.....	10,375	483		10,858
Railroad Administration.....	1			1
Railroad Retirement Board.....	1,275			1,275
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	3,846			3,846
Rural Electrification Administration.....	690			690
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	1,436			1,436
Smithsonian Institution.....	467			467
Social Security Board.....	8,878			8,878
Tariff Commission.....	302			302
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	3,476	10,774		14,250
Veterans' Administration.....	35,342	1,065	11	36,418
Works Progress Administration.....			29,648	29,648
Total, 48 independent establishments.....	117,376	12,556	32,681	162,613

**GRAND TOTAL EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND 48 INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENTS**

President's office and executive departments.....	645,204	80,562	28,924	754,690
48 independent establishments.....	117,376	12,556	32,681	162,613
Grand total.....	762,580	93,118	61,605	917,303

Total pay roll for the 917,303 persons employed in the executive departments and 48 independent establishments during month of December 1938 was \$141,924,984. This is the pay roll for 1 month.

Mr. KING. I have here a small list, which is very gratifying, of the employees of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, including the Library of Congress and the Botanic Gardens as of December 31, 1938, showing the number to be 5,145. The number of employees in the judicial branch of the Federal Government as of December 31, 1938, was only 2,271. The judicial branch of the Government sets an example of economy that other departments might well follow.

Mr. President, I have before me a tabulation of personnel under the heading "National Defense," including the War Department, the Navy Department, the Marine Corps, and the

Coast Guard, showing a total of 335,952. I ask that that be inserted in the RECORD without reading.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*National defense*

(Figures on civilian and administrative personnel are included in the figures for the executive departments and do not appear below)

<b>War Department (as of Dec. 31, 1938):</b>	
Commissioned officers.....	12,662
Warrant officers.....	774
<b>Total officers.....</b>	<b>13,436</b>
Enlisted men.....	164,249
Philippine Scouts.....	6,377
Nurses.....	683
West Point cadets.....	1,813
<b>Total enlisted men.....</b>	<b>173,127</b>
<b>Total War Department officers and enlisted men.....</b>	<b>186,563</b>
<b>Navy Department (as of Feb. 1, 1939):</b>	
Line officers.....	6,447
Staff officers.....	2,105
Commissioned warrant officers.....	1,008
Warrant officers.....	591
<b>Total officers.....</b>	<b>10,151</b>
Enlisted men.....	107,962
Annapolis midshipmen.....	2,290
<b>Total enlisted men.....</b>	<b>110,252</b>
<b>Total Navy Department officers and enlisted men.....</b>	<b>120,403</b>
<b>Marine Corps (as of Dec. 31, 1938):</b>	
Commissioned officers.....	1,214
Chief warrant officers.....	91
Warrant officers.....	53
<b>Total officers.....</b>	<b>1,358</b>
Enlisted men.....	17,546
<b>Total Marine Corps officers and enlisted men.....</b>	<b>18,904</b>
<b>Coast Guard (as of June 30, 1938):</b>	
Commissioned officers.....	524
Chief warrant officers.....	389
Regular warrant officers.....	153
Temporary warrant officers.....	135
<b>Total officers.....</b>	<b>1,201</b>
Enlisted men.....	8,803
Cadets.....	78
<b>Total enlisted men and cadets.....</b>	<b>8,881</b>
<b>Total Coast Guard officers and enlisted men.....</b>	<b>10,082</b>
<b>Total of all officers, enlisted men, and cadets of the War and Navy Departments, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard.....</b>	<b>335,952</b>

Mr. KING. I also have a tabulation showing employees under the Civilian Conservation Corps, the National Youth Administration, and the Works Progress Administration, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Civilian Conservation Corps, as of Dec. 31, 1938*

C. C. C. enrollees in United States.....	252,521
C. C. C. Indian enrollees.....	7,830
C. C. C. enrollees in Territories:	
Alaska.....	742
Hawaii.....	887
Puerto Rico.....	1,724
Virgin Islands.....	381
<b>Total enrollees.....</b>	<b>264,085</b>
Reserve officers and warrant officers working with C. C. C.....	4,935
<b>Total, C. C. C. enrollees and officers.....</b>	<b>269,020</b>

(NOTE.—The C. C. C. administrative personnel, numbering 31,847, is included with the personnel of the executive departments to which the workers are assigned and are not counted above. Also,

the figure for enrollees is unusually low, since December 31, 1938, was the end of a discharge period. The total enrollees in continental United States, excluding the Indians, as of January 31, 1939, was 292,971, or an increase of more than 40,000 during the month of January.)

*National Youth Administration, as of Dec. 31, 1938*

Employed on the student-aid program.....	368,921
Employed on N. Y. A. works program.....	239,627

**Total employed on N. Y. A. projects..... 608,548**

The pay roll for the above N. Y. A. employees for month of December 1938 was: Student aid, \$2,395,855; and works program, \$4,395,682; or a total of \$6,791,537.

*WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION*

*Number of persons employed on W. P. A. operated projects, by major types of projects, in continental United States, for week ending Nov. 26, 1938, 3,213,510*

Highways, roads, and streets.....	1,512,330
Public buildings.....	278,873
Parks and other recreation.....	233,215
Conservation.....	126,618
Sewer systems and other utilities.....	253,979
Airports and other transportation.....	51,224
"White collar".....	352,194
Sewing and other goods.....	263,477
Sanitation and health.....	87,651
Miscellaneous.....	53,949

Mr. KING. Of course, in our—I was about to say hysteria, but I will not use that expression—in our great concern over the situation in Europe we cannot tell what military demands will be made and the number of persons who will be required in the War Department, the Navy Department, the Coast Guard, in the Aviation Service, and in other branches of the Government which fall within the category of national defense. Undoubtedly there will be a large increase, which will absorb perhaps the \$2,000,000,000 and more which we will appropriate for so-called national defense before the adjournment of Congress. I make the prediction without any fear that my prediction will not be verified that our appropriations for the Army and the Navy and for all other branches falling within the category of national defense will exceed \$2,500,000,000 before the Congress adjourns.

The question arises, Where will we obtain the \$10,000,000,000 we will appropriate, and what provisions will be made to meet the authorizations which will be \$4,000,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000 more? I have indicated—and I apologize for repeating—it seems to me we are on the road to national bankruptcy. We must change our policy. Spending is too great; taxes are too heavy; and when we increase taxes, as we probably will before adjournment, tax resistance will be encountered. That situation ought to be an admonition to the Congress to reduce expenditures and pursue a course that within a reasonable time will lift the burden of taxation from the people and place the Government upon the highway leading to a balanced Budget.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I am in favor of economy in government. I am very much in favor of reductions in Government expenditures, but I am not in favor of making these reductions entirely at the expense of agriculture. Congress is appropriating lavishly for every other purpose. I do not propose to see the farmer ruined in the name of an alleged program of economy which proposes to economize only at the expense of agriculture. So I intend to support the amendment providing \$225,000,000 for parity payments—payments which have been promised by Congress in the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

I suppose I could spend several hours in telling you of the conditions affecting agriculture in this Nation today, but I do not believe that is necessary. It may be that a few figures by themselves will give you the picture.

Most of our national farm legislation to date has been based on attempting to regain and then retain the relationship between agriculture and industry which prevailed during the period 1909–14.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture publishes monthly a bulletin entitled "The Agricultural Situation." The current issue of this bulletin gives the following information as to the farm price situation in relation to industry and labor:



Industrial wages in February of this year were 213 percent of the 1909-14 level.

Wholesale prices of all commodities were 112 percent of the 1909-14 level.

Taxes paid by farmers are 161 percent of the amount they paid in 1909-14.

Remember, Mr. President, that these figures represent how much more the farmer has to pay for things today. The wages of labor, for example, go into what he pays. So do taxes.

Now, let us look at the other side of the picture. Let us see the prices received by farmers for their products. For all grains the average farm price in March of this year was 66 percent of 1909-14 prices. Cotton and cottonseed prices were 71 percent. These are the commodities which would receive parity payments from the \$225,000,000 proposed in this measure. These farmers are receiving from 66 to 71 percent of the prices they received in 1909-14. They are paying 120 percent of the prices they paid in 1909-14.

I believe that is the picture.

Last year the Congress passed the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. Whether or not that measure represents the best that Government can do to help solve the farm problem is not the question that is before us. We passed that act. It includes a provision that whenever farm prices are below 75 percent of parity, the Federal Government will, in part at least, make up the difference through adjustment, or so-called parity payments.

Mr. President, those conditions prevail today. Under present price conditions producers of the five commodities named in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 will fall short this year nearly \$1,000,000,000 of parity income, according to my best information.

Mr. President, it seems to me we have before us a very plain and simple proposition. Congress has said to the producers of these commodities, "If you will comply with the national farm program, and the prices received are sufficiently below parity, the Government will make up part at least of the difference through adjustment payments."

Prices of these commodities are so much below parity today that it would take \$1,000,000,000 to make up the entire difference. It seems to me there is no excuse for the Senate rejecting an appropriation of less than one-fourth that difference—the \$225,000,000 provided in the committee amendment. Congress ought to live up to the contract at least to that extent.

So much for the law and the facts in the case. Under the law and the facts Congress owes it to cooperating farmers to make provision for adjustment or parity payments.

But there also is the human element. Now, if ever, the farmers of my part of the country need Government assistance if they are to survive. The plight of the small farmer is especially pitiful. This appropriation will help him to some extent, though not as much as I should like; but at least he will get that much. So I hope to see this bill receive the approval of the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Clark, Idaho	Hayden	Minton
Andrews	Clark, Mo.	Herring	Murray
Ashurst	Connally	Hill	Norris
Austin	Danaher	Holman	Nye
Bailey	Davis	Holt	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Donahay	Hughes	Overton
Barbour	Downey	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper
Barkley	Ellender	King	Pittman
Bilbo	Frazier	La Follette	Radcliffe
Bone	George	Lee	Reed
Borah	Gibson	Logan	Reynolds
Bridges	Gillette	Lucas	Russell
Bulow	Glass	Lundeen	Schwartz
Burke	Green	McCarran	Schwellenbach
Byrd	Guffey	McKellar	Sheppard
Byrnes	Gurney	McNary	Shipstead
Capper	Hale	Maloney	Slattery
Caraway	Harrison	Mead	Smathers
Chavez	Hatch	Miller	Stewart

Taft	Townsend	Vandenberg	Wheeler
Thomas, Okla.	Truman	Wagner	
Thomas, Utah	Tydings	Walsh	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAVEZ in the chair). Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee, beginning on page 50, line 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 3, before the word "of", to strike out "\$18,746,979" and insert "\$20,972,285", and in line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$59,528" and insert "\$62,328", so as to read:

Total, Forest Service, \$20,972,285, of which amount not to exceed \$62,328 shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of field work outside the District of Columbia, and, in addition thereto, there is authorized for expenditure from funds provided for carrying out the provisions of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921 (23 U. S. C. 21, 23), not to exceed \$9,755 for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for use by the Forest Service in the construction and maintenance of national-forest roads.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering, salaries and expenses", on page 52, line 24, after the word "analysis", to strike out "\$407,500" and insert "\$411,500", and in line 25, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$15,000" and insert "\$19,000", so as to read:

Agricultural chemical investigations: For conducting the investigations contemplated by the act of May 15, 1862 (5 U. S. C. 511, 512), relating to the application of chemistry to agriculture; for the biological, chemical, physical, microscopical, and technological investigation of foods, feeds, drugs, plant and animal products, and substances used in the manufacture thereof; for investigations of the physiological effects and for the pharmacological testing of such products and of insecticides; for the investigation and development of methods for the manufacture of sugars, sugar sirups, and starches and the utilization of new agricultural materials for such purposes; for the technological investigation of the utilization of fruits and vegetables and for frozen pack investigations; for the investigation of chemicals for the control of noxious weeds and plants; and to cooperate with associations and scientific societies in the development of methods of analysis, \$411,500, of which amount not to exceed \$19,000 shall be available for the construction and equipment of an addition to the United States Citrus Products Laboratory, Winter Haven, Fla.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 4, after the word "and", to insert "drainage and"; and line 18, after the word "reports", to strike out "\$339,469" and insert "\$359,469", so as to read:

Agricultural engineering investigations: For investigations, experiments, and demonstrations involving the application of engineering principles to agriculture for the investigation, development, experimental demonstration, and application of methods for the prevention and control of dust explosions and fires during the harvesting, handling, milling, processing, fumigating, and storing of agricultural products, and of other dust explosions and resulting fires not otherwise provided for, including fires in grain mills and elevators, cotton gins, cotton-oil mills, and other structures; the heating, charring, and ignition of agricultural products; fires on farms and in rural communities and other explosions and fires in connection with farm and agricultural operations; for investigating and reporting upon the different kinds of farm power and appliances; upon farm domestic water supply and drainage and sewage disposal; upon the design and construction of farm buildings and their appurtenances and of buildings for processing and storing farm products; upon farm power and mechanical farm equipment and rural electrification; upon the engineering problems relating to the processing, transportation, and storage of perishable and other agricultural products; and upon the engineering problems involved in adapting physical characteristics of farm land to the use of modern farm machinery; for investigations of cotton ginning under the act approved April 19, 1930 (7 U. S. Co. 424, 425); for giving expert advice and assistance in agricultural and chemical engineering; for collating, reporting, and illustrating the results of investigations and preparing, publishing, and distributing bulletins, plans, and reports, \$359,469.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 2, after "(5 U. S. C. 556b)", to strike out "\$79,400" and insert "\$100,000", so as to read:

Naval-stores investigations: For the investigation of naval stores (turpentine and rosin) and their components; the investigation and

experimental demonstration of improved equipment, methods, or processes of preparing naval stores; the weighing, storing, handling, transportation, and utilization of naval stores; and for the assembling and compilation of data on production, distribution, and consumption of turpentine and rosin, pursuant to the act of August 15, 1935 (5 U. S. C. 556b), \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 6, after the word "use", to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$263,800", so as to read:

Fertilizer investigations: For investigations within the United States of fertilizers, fertilizer ingredients, including phosphoric acid and potash, and other soil amendments and their suitability for agricultural use, \$263,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 8, before the word "of", to strike out "\$1,330,369" and insert "\$1,438,769"; and in line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$875,000" and insert "\$922,826", so as to read:

Total, salaries and expenses, Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering, \$1,438,769, of which amount not to exceed \$922,826 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, and not to exceed \$3,725 shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of field work outside the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, salaries and expenses", on page 56, line 20, after the word "nuts", to strike out "\$378,600" and insert "\$428,600", so as to read:

Fruit insects: For insects affecting fruits, grapes, and nuts, \$428,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, after line 22, to strike out:

Sweetpotato weevil: For the determination of such methods of control for sweetpotato weevils as may be necessary, \$75,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of farm animals, farm crops, or other property injured or destroyed.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Sweetpotato weevil control: For the determination and application of such methods of control for sweetpotato weevils as, in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture, may be necessary, \$75,000: *Provided*, That, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the control of sweetpotato weevil in any State until such State has provided cooperation necessary to accomplish this purpose: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of farm animals, farm crops, or other property injured or destroyed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, after line 12, to insert:

Mexican fruitfly control: For the control and prevention of spread of the Mexican fruitfly, including necessary surveys and control operations in Mexico in cooperation with the Mexican Government or local Mexican authorities, \$160,460.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, after line 16, to insert:

Citrus canker eradication: For determining and applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease of citrus trees known as "citrus canker" as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary, including cooperation with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations of growers, or individuals, as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purposes, \$13,485: *Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, after line 2, to insert:

Gypsy and brown-tail moth control: For the control and prevention of spread of the gypsy and brown-tail moths, \$375,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, after line 5, to insert:

Dutch elm disease eradication: For determining and applying methods of eradication, control, and prevention of spread of the disease of elm trees known as "Dutch elm disease" and of a virus disease of elm trees prevalent in the Ohio Valley, \$500,000: *Provided*, That, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, no expenditures from this appropriation shall be made for these purposes until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by State, county, or local authorities, or by individuals, or organizations concerned: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 19, after the word "shrubs", to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$253,100", so as to read:

Forest insects: For insects affecting forests and forest products, under section 4 of the act approved May 22, 1928 (16 U. S. C. 581c), entitled "An act to insure adequate supplies of timber and other forest products for the people of the United States, to promote the full use for timber growing and other purposes of forest lands in the United States, including farm wood lots and those abandoned areas not suitable for agricultural production, and to secure the correlation and the most economical conduct of forest research in the Department of Agriculture, through research in reforestation, timber growing, protection, utilization, forest economics and related subjects," and for insects affecting ornamental trees and shrubs, \$253,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 25, after the word "purposes", to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$200,000", so as to read:

Barberry eradication: For the eradication of the common barberry and for applying such other methods of eradication, control, and prevention of spread of cereal rusts as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary to accomplish such purposes, \$200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 16, after the word "authorities", to strike out "\$446,800" and insert "\$1,366,800", so as to read:

Pink bollworm control: For the control and prevention of spread of the pink bollworm, including the establishment of such cotton-free areas as may be necessary to stamp out any infestation, and for necessary surveys and control operations in Mexico in cooperation with the Mexican Government or local Mexican authorities, \$1,366,800.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee? The item in line 16, page 61, seems to indicate that the Senate committee has multiplied the House figure about three times. Will the Senator make an explanation of that rather amazing increase?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, recently there has been discovered in the Rio Grande Valley in Texas a considerable area infested by the new insect pest known as the pink bollworm. The insect at present is confined to a relatively small area. The authorities in charge of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine believe that if they are allowed the amount of money carried in the pending bill, the pest can be entirely eradicated. Negotiations are in progress with the Mexican Government looking to the establishment of a 50-mile zone on each side of the river which would prevent the insect coming back into our country.

The Senator from Michigan doubtless is familiar with the ravages of what is known as the boll weevil, which took an enormous economic toll of the South. It has been said that perhaps that would have disposed of the cotton surplus; but the unfortunate part of the matter is that the weevil did not attack the cotton plant equally over the entire Cotton Belt. It would come into a certain area, destroy all of the crop there, and thereby impoverish the farmers in the area where the insect had come, but would not affect the cotton being grown in other areas.

Dr. Strong, the head of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, stated that in his opinion the \$920,000 increase would enable the Department to eradicate this pest. There was a Budget estimate for half of this amount, \$460,000; so the report of the committee exceeds the Budget estimate for this item by only that amount, \$460,000.



It is good economy for the Government to attack these insects comprehensively when they are in a very small area. For example, when the Japanese beetle first was found in this country, it covered only a little plot of land in New Jersey, a plot less than 7 acres in extent. The Government could have purchased that land, it could have been burned over and had everything on it destroyed for about one-twentieth of the amount we have appropriated from year to year in undertaking to combat the Japanese beetle all over the country, and in addition there would have been saved the huge sums which have been lost by the fruit people and by the truck producers of the country due to the ravages of the insect.

The committee decided that it would be better to attempt to eliminate the pink bollworm all at one time, as the experts whom we pay to advise us on these matters suggested we do, rather than to let it spread all over the entire belt, and to have the Government compelled to appropriate millions of dollars to carry on a more far-flung campaign over a long number of years in an effort to eliminate this pest, which is just as disastrous or more injurious than was the Mexican boll weevil.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 61, line 16.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 18, to strike out "\$63,000" and insert "\$83,000", so as to read:

Bee culture: For bee culture and apiary management, \$83,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 18, to insert:

Thurberia weevil control: For the control and prevention of spread of the Thurberia weevil, \$2,808.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 22, after the word "animals", to strike out "\$181,500" and insert "\$191,100", so as to read:

Insects affecting man and animals: For insects affecting man, household possessions, and animals, \$191,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 4, after the word "control", to strike out "\$149,790" and insert "\$159,790", so as to read:

Insect-pest survey and identification: For the identification and classification of insects, including taxonomic, morphological, and related phases of insect-pest control and the maintenance of an insect-pest survey for the collection and dissemination of information to Federal, State, and other agencies concerned with insect-pest control, \$159,790.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 16, after the word "control", to strike out "\$62,518" and insert "\$72,518", so as to read:

Control investigations: For developing equipment or apparatus to aid in enforcing plant quarantines, eradication and control of plant pests, determining methods of disinfecting plants and plant products to eliminate injurious pests, determining the toxicity of insecticides, and related phases of insect-pest control, \$72,518.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 21, after the word "fungicides", to strike out "\$129,984" and insert "\$140,000", so as to read:

Insecticide and fungicide investigations: For the investigation and development of methods of manufacturing insecticides and fungicides, and for investigating chemical problems relating to the composition, action, and application of insecticides and fungicides, \$140,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 13, after the name "Mexico", to strike out "\$650,000" and insert "\$680,000", so as to read:

LXXXIV—331

Foreign plant quarantines: For enforcement of foreign plant quarantines, at the port of entry and port of export, and to prevent the movement of cotton and cottonseed from Mexico into the United States, including the regulation of the entry into the United States of railway cars and other vehicles, and freight, express, baggage, or other materials from Mexico, and the inspection, cleaning, and disinfection thereof, including construction and repair of necessary buildings, plants, and equipment, for the fumigation, disinfection, or cleaning of products, railway cars, or other vehicles entering the United States from Mexico, \$680,000:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, after line 4, to insert:

Control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases: Not to exceed \$400,000 of the funds appropriated under this head in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1939 (Public No. 7, 76th Cong.), approved March 15, 1939, shall remain available until June 30, 1940.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, after line 10, to insert:

Control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1939, to be immediately available and to remain available until December 31, 1939, for carrying out the purposes and provisions of, and for expenditures authorized under, the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution making funds available for the control of incipient or emergency outbreaks of insect pests or plant diseases, including grasshoppers, Mormon crickets, and chinch bugs", approved April 6, 1937, as amended, \$2,417,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 22, before the word "of", to strike out "\$4,967,401" and insert "\$9,126,425"; in line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$867,010" and insert "\$889,286"; and in line 25, before the word "shall", to strike out "\$33,900" and insert "\$42,375", so as to read:

Total salaries and expenses, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, \$9,126,425, of which amount not to exceed \$889,286 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia and not to exceed \$42,375 shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of field work outside the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Biological Survey, salaries and expenses", on page 66, at the end of line 25, to strike out "\$650,000" and insert "\$750,000", so as to read:

Control of predatory animals and injurious rodents: For investigations, demonstrations, and cooperation in destroying animals injurious to agriculture, horticulture, forestry, animal husbandry, and wild game, as authorized by the act of March 2, 1931 (7 U. S. C. 426-426b); and in protecting stock and other domestic animals through the suppression of rabies and other diseases in predatory wild animals; and for construction, repairs, additions, and installations in and about the grounds and buildings of the game-management supply depot and laboratory at Pocatello, Idaho, including purchase, transportation, and handling of supplies and materials for distribution from said depot to other projects, in accordance with the provisions of the act approved June 24, 1936 (16 U. S. C. 667), \$750,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 16, after the word "roads", to insert "including the purchase of necessary materials to be used in conjunction with Works Progress Administration labor in improving roads in the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, not exceeding \$30,000"; and on page 69, line 5, after the word "Refuge", to strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$680,000", so as to read:

Maintenance of mammal and bird reservations: For the maintenance of the Montana National Bison Range, the Upper Mississippi River Wildlife Refuge, the Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge, the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, and other reservations, and for the maintenance of game introduced into suitable localities on public lands, under supervision of the Biological Survey, including construction of fencing, wardens' quarters, shelters for animals, landings, roads, including the purchase of necessary materials to be used in conjunction with Works Progress Administration labor in improving roads in the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, not exceeding \$30,000, trails, bridges, ditches, telephone lines, rock-work, bulkheads, and other improvements necessary for the economical administration and protection of the reservation; for the enforcement of section 84 of the act approved March 4, 1909 (18 U. S. C. 145), entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the

penal laws of the United States," and acts amendatory thereto, and section 10 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of February 18, 1929 (16 U. S. C. 715i); for the purchase, capture, and transportation of game for national reservations; and for the maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, \$680,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 22, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$2,288,691" and insert "\$2,468,691", so as to read:

In all, salaries and expenses, \$2,468,691.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 23, after the name "Mississippi", to insert "River", so as to make the subhead read: "Upper Mississippi River Wildlife Refuge."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Migratory bird conservation fund", on page 70, line 9, after the word "funds", to insert "for the acquisition of areas for use as migratory-bird sanctuaries, refuges, and breeding grounds, for developing and administering such areas", so as to read:

For carrying into effect the provisions of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to supplement and support the Migratory Bird Conservation Act by providing funds for the acquisition of areas for use as migratory-bird sanctuaries, refuges, and breeding grounds, for developing and administering such areas, for the protection of certain migratory birds, for the enforcement of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and regulations thereunder, and for other purposes", approved March 16, 1934, as amended by an act entitled "An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, and certain other acts relating to game and other wildlife, administered by the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes", approved June 15, 1935 (16 U. S. C. 718-718h), an amount equal to the sum received during the fiscal year 1940 from the proceeds from the sale of stamps, to be warranted monthly; and in addition thereto an amount equal to the unobligated balance on June 30, 1939, of the total of the proceeds received from the sale of stamps prior to July 1, 1939:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration", on page 71, line 11, before the colon and the word "Provided", to strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$2,000,000", so as to read:

For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife restoration projects, and for other purposes", approved September 2, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 669-669j), \$2,000,000:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 14, after the word "Survey", to strike out "\$3,973,691" and insert "\$4,653,691", and in line 15, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$655,040" and insert "\$711,610", so as to read:

Total, Bureau of Biological Survey, \$4,653,691, of which amount not to exceed \$711,610 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, and not to exceed \$72,100 shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of field work outside the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Public Roads, elimination of grade crossings", on page 75, line 11, before the word "authorized", to strike out "the amount" and insert "part of the \$50,000,000", so as to read:

For the elimination of hazards to life at railroad grade crossings, including the separation or protection of grades at crossings, the reconstruction of existing railroad grade-crossing structures, and the relocation of highways to eliminate grade crossings, \$40,000,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, which sum is part of the \$50,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1939 by section 8 of the act approved June 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1521).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Agricultural Marketing Service, salaries and expenses", on page 77, line 25, after the word "world", to strike out "\$418,970" and insert "\$443,970", so as to read:

Marketing farm products: For acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information relative to the standardization, classification, grading, preparation for market, handling, and marketing of farm and food products, including the

demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform standards of classification of American farm and food products throughout the world, \$443,970.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, line 17, before the colon and the word "Provided", to strike out "\$642,799" and insert "\$757,510"; and in line 21, after the word "cotton", to strike out the colon and "Provided further, That estimates of apple production shall be confined to the commercial crop", so as to read:

Crop and livestock estimates: For collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and publishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and livestock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, staples of cotton, stocks, and value of farm crops and numbers, grades, and value of livestock and livestock products on farms, in cooperation with the Extension Service and other Federal, State, and local agencies, and for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts as provided by the act approved June 24, 1936, as amended May 12, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 951-957), \$757,510: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating, or publishing a report stating the intention of farmers as to the acreage to be planted in cotton.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 19, after the word "contained", to strike out "\$450,000" and insert "\$500,000", so as to read:

Market inspection of farm products: For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, boards of trade, chambers of commerce, or other associations of businessmen or trade organizations, and persons or corporations engaged in the production, transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, whether operating in one or more jurisdictions, to investigate and certify to shippers and other interested parties the class, quality, and condition of cotton, tobacco, fruits, and vegetables, whether raw, dried, or canned, poultry, butter, hay, and other perishable farm products when offered for interstate shipment or when received at such important central markets as the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time designate, or at points which may be conveniently reached therefrom, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for the service rendered: *Provided*, That certificates issued by the authorized agents of the Department shall be received in all courts of the United States as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein contained, \$500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 20, after the word "products", to strike out "\$1,122,302" and insert "\$1,160,000", so as to read:

Market news service: For collecting, publishing, and distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely information on the market supply and demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds, cottonseed, and seeds, and other agricultural products, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the production, transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, \$1,160,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, line 8, after "(7 U. S. C. 491-497)", to strike out "\$149,628" and insert "\$160,000", so as to read:

Perishable Agricultural Commodities and Produce Agency Acts: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act to suppress unfair and fraudulent practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce", as amended (7 U. S. C. 499a-499r), and the act entitled "An act to prevent the destruction or dumping, without good and sufficient cause therefor, of farm produce received in interstate commerce by commission merchants and others and to require them truly and correctly to account for all farm produce received by them", approved March 3, 1927 (7 U. S. C. 491-497), \$160,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, at the end of line 19, to strike out "\$17,000" and insert "\$22,000", so as to read:

Standard container acts: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the act entitled "An act to fix standards for Climax baskets for grapes and other fruits and vegetables, and to



fix standards for baskets and other containers for small fruits, berries, and vegetables, and for other purposes," approved August 31, 1916 (15 U. S. C. 251-256), the act entitled "An act to fix standards for hampers, round stave baskets, and splint baskets for fruits and vegetables, and for other purposes," approved May 21, 1928 (15 U. S. C. 257-257i), \$22,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 4, after the numerals "471" to strike out "476e" and insert "476"; and in line 5, to strike out "\$460,000" and insert "\$480,000", so as to read:

Cotton Quality Statistics and Classing Acts: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton," approved March 3, 1927, as amended by the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to provide for the classification of cotton, to furnish information on market supply, demand, location, condition, and market prices for cotton, and for other purposes," approved April 13, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 471-476), \$480,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 20, to strike out "\$491,900" and insert "\$507,000", so as to read:

United States Cotton Futures and United States Cotton Standards Acts: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the United States Cotton Futures Act, as amended March 4, 1919 (26 U. S. C. 1090-1106), and to carry into effect the provisions of the United States Cotton Standards Act, approved March 4, 1923 (7 U. S. C. 51-65), including such means as may be necessary for effectuating agreements heretofore or hereafter made with cotton associations, cotton exchanges, and other cotton organizations in foreign countries, for the adoption, use, and observance of universal standards of cotton classification, for the arbitration or settlement of disputes with respect thereto, and for the preparation, distribution, inspection, and protection of the practical forms or copies thereof under such agreements, \$507,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 23, after the word "Act", to strike out "\$723,941" and insert "\$760,000", so as to read:

United States Grain Standards Act: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the United States Grain Standards Act, \$760,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, line 3, after the word "Act", to strike out "\$391,700" and insert "\$425,000", so as to read:

United States Warehouse Act: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the United States Warehouse Act, \$425,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, line 2, after "218-218d)", to strike out "\$300,000" and insert "\$381,879", so as to read:

Packers and Stockyards Act: For carrying out the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, approved August 15, 1921 (7 U. S. C. 181-229), as amended by the act of August 14, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 218-218d), \$381,879.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, line 25, before the word "of", to strike out "\$5,767,526" and insert "\$6,274,145"; and on page 85, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$1,479,000" and insert "\$1,585,783", so as to read:

Total, salaries and expenses, Agricultural Marketing Service, \$6,274,145, of which amount not to exceed \$1,585,783 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, and not to exceed \$40,100 shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of field work outside the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Food and Drug Administration, salaries and expenses", on page 87, line 16, after the word "therein", to strike out "\$2,283,380" and insert "\$2,455,000", so as to read:

Enforcement of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act: For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act of June 25, 1938 (21 U. S. C. 301-392), entitled "An act to prohibit the movement in interstate commerce of adulterated and misbranded food, drugs, devices, and cosmetics, and for other purposes"; to cooperate with associations and scien-

tific societies in the revision of the United States Pharmacopoeia and development of methods of analysis, and for investigating the character of the chemical and physical tests which are applied to American food products in foreign countries, and for inspecting the same before shipment when desired by the shippers or owners of these products intended for countries where chemical and physical tests are required before the said products are allowed to be sold therein, \$2,455,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, after line 17, to insert:

Enforcement of the Tea Importation Act: For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act approved March 2, 1897 (21 U. S. C. 41-50), entitled "An act to prevent the importation of impure and unwholesome tea", as amended, including payment of compensation and expenses of the members of the Board appointed under section 2 of the act and all other necessary officers and employees, \$40,094.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 10, after the word "purposes" and the quotation mark, to strike out "\$183,180" and insert "\$208,180", so as to read:

Enforcement of the Insecticide Act: For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act of April 26, 1910 (7 U. S. C. 121-134), entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded paris greens, lead arsenates, other insecticides, and also fungicides, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes", \$208,180.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 89, line 18, before the word "of", to strike out "\$2,701,044" and insert "\$2,932,758"; in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$822,158" and insert "\$827,018"; and in line 21, before the word "shall", to strike out "\$27,375" and insert "\$35,625", so as to read:

Total salaries and expenses, Food and Drug Administration, \$2,932,758, of which amount not to exceed \$827,018 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, and not to exceed \$35,625 shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of field work outside the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Soil Conservation Service, salaries and expenses", on page 92, line 1, after the word "emergency", to strike out "or other", so as to read:

General administrative expenses: For necessary expenses for general administrative purposes, including the salary of the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service and other personal services in the District of Columbia, \$552,050: *Provided*, That no part of the money appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for expenditures if any emergency appropriations are made available for administrative expenses in administering the funds provided in regular appropriations to the Soil Conservation Service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 92, after line 21, to insert:

Emergency erosion control, Everglades region, Florida: For research and demonstration work in soil conservation control measures, including fire control and irrigation construction work to eliminate fire hazards, in the Everglades region of Florida, \$75,000: *Provided*, That no expenditures shall be made for these purposes until a sum at least equal to such expenditures shall have been made available by the State of Florida for the same purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 93, line 6, before the word "of," to strike out "\$23,645,584" and insert "\$23,720,584", and in line 11, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out the colon and "*Provided*", That of the funds made available in this paragraph, not exceeding \$500,000 shall be available for general administrative expenses in the District of Columbia and not exceeding \$1,300,000 of such funds may be expended in the District of Columbia for personal services in connection with research and investigation, cooperative relations and planning, map reproduction, and technical supervisory and inspectional activities", so as to read:

Total salaries and expenses, Soil Conservation Service, \$23,720,584, of which not to exceed \$1,734,636 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, and not to exceed \$100,000

shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of field work outside the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources, Department of Agriculture", on page 94, line 21, after the numerals "1938", to strike out the comma and "and not to exceed \$3,200,000 shall be available under the provisions of section 202 (a) to 202 (c), inclusive, of said act, including research on food products of farm commodities," so as to read:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936 (16 U. S. C. 590g-590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 31-70) (except the making of payments pursuant to sections 303 and 381 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; rent in the District of Columbia; not to exceed \$50,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers, \$429,560,000, together with not to exceed \$70,000,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation made under this head by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1938, in all, not to exceed \$499,560,000, to remain available until June 30, 1941, for compliances under said Act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1939 programs carried out during the period October 1, 1938, to December 31, 1939, inclusive: *Provided*, That no part of such amount shall be available for carrying out the provisions of section 202 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 96, after line 12, to insert:

#### PARITY PAYMENTS

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make parity payments to producers of wheat, cotton, corn (in the commercial corn-producing area), rice, and tobacco pursuant to the provisions of section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, \$225,000,000: *Provided, however*, That in expending the appropriation in this paragraph the rate of payment with respect to any commodity shall not exceed the amount by which the average farm price of the commodity is less than 75 percent of the parity price: *Provided further*, That such payments with respect to any such commodity shall be made with respect to a farm only in the event that the acreage planted to the commodity for harvest on the farm in 1940 is not in excess of the farm acreage allotment established for the commodity under the agricultural conservation program.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in the belief that a few plain words and some fundamental logic might conceivably be of benefit at this time, I wish to discuss briefly, during this deliberation over America's agricultural problem and the debate concerning what course should be followed by the Congress, some events which have occurred behind the scenes in recent weeks and which have had a profound effect in the shaping of the proposed legislation.

In the first place, it has been apparent for at least the last 20 years that until some basis of prosperity is restored to agriculture and to the purchasing power of the American farmer there can be no prosperity for industry or commerce. In other words, the welfare of our entire Nation rests upon and is firmly linked with the welfare of agriculture. Note that I do not say, nor would I ever contend, that agriculture should be given preferential treatment. My argument is only that one major phase of our national economy cannot be neglected, or the entire economic structure will be weakened.

A few nights ago, in a radio address during which I discussed this problem with three of my distinguished colleagues, I drew a word picture which I think it is pertinent to repeat at this time.

What a lovely scene is unfolded before our eyes when we think of golden fields of wheat waving restlessly under a summer sun, and of lowing herds of dairy cattle grazing peacefully in the North Central and New England States, and of tassel-topped stalks of corn towering above the prairie land of my own Illinois and of other parts of the Middle West, and of seemingly endless rows of cotton in the South.

My comment was that this was a pleasant, pastoral scene to contemplate in an abstract sort of way. But I pointed out that there was a discordant note in this lovely picture.

Behind those scenes of bounteous abundance and pastoral contentment and apparently inexhaustible fertility lies something ominous and disturbing.

The ugly, blunt economic fact is that the wheat which waves so beautifully in the summer sun is translated into an unpleasant reality of overabundance and low prices, and the farmer who grows it has difficulty in maintaining a balanced economy. The milk and cheese and butter which are produced from herds of dairy cattle flow into the market in such tremendous quantities that today we have an unmarketable surplus, and the dairy farmer is faced with actual want. Likewise there is tragedy in the overproduction of cotton, and economic danger in the high yields of corn.

Until some genius, statesman, or economist rectifies the flaw in our system of distribution there will ever be a necessity for agricultural legislation which controls the chronic surpluses of our basic commodities. And until domestic consumption increases and export sales are steadied so that the farmer may receive a fair return, there will be a necessity for remedial legislation which will enable him to keep on farming.

We are dealing with the world as it is and not the world as we would like to have it. Therefore, we must face facts as they are; and the facts are that the men who produce not only our corn and cotton and wheat and rice and tobacco, but the farmers who produce our dairy products, our fruits, and vegetables, and the thousand and one other component parts of American agriculture, are direly in need of financial aid at the present time to tide them over during this period of unsettled world and domestic conditions.

Those of us who come from States and from districts largely agricultural are only too well aware of conditions that now exist on the farm. It is not my purpose to be a prophet of gloom. I would be the last to attempt to declare that the problems of the American farmer are not possible of solution. It is my firm conviction that under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938—strengthened as it was by the recent Supreme Court decision—we have made greater strides toward an eventual solution of the farm problem than has been made heretofore in the history of our Nation.

Nevertheless, a vast and complicated problem still lies before us, and it is to that we must turn our immediate attention. The Supreme Court recently dispelled the cloud of fear under which those interested in the farm problem have labored during the past decade, yet it is obvious that emergency farm legislation will be necessary for some years to come.

I call the attention of the Senate to this particular point that during the last 20 years farm legislation has been before Congress in one form or another. Senators will recall that farm legislation advocated by both Democrats and Republicans in a nonpartisan way in years gone by upon three different occasions met the fate of a Presidential veto, and that during the early part of the present administration we found farm legislation, created and passed under the present administration, crippled temporarily at least by the Supreme Court decision in the A. A. A. case, the Supreme Court holding in that case that agriculture was a local rather than a national problem. So during all these years the farmer has been operating under a cloud of fear, a little here and a little there, wondering just what the executive or the judicial branch of the Government might do to this piece of legislation or that in the event we should pass it. I say that today we are on firmer ground from the standpoint of legislation than we have ever been before because of the recent Supreme Court decision, realizing that this decision will be helpful to the farmer in the future from the standpoint of legislation, yet it is not a panacea for the evils which exist, and emergency legislation is necessary now and will be necessary for a good many years to come.

Having had some experience as a member of the Agricultural Committee of the House of Representatives I was naturally interested in the bill when it was before the House. I saw many items stricken from the bill, because there was no unified program for all agriculture.



With that thought in mind I took somewhat the initiative in the Senate by calling a group of Senators from the Western and Midwestern States into conference to discuss the various aspects of the farm problem, not from the standpoint of any particular section or any particular commodity, but from the standpoint of a unified broad-scale program for all agriculture throughout America. After conferences with a number of distinguished Senators from the North and the West, representing dairying, wheat, and corn districts, it was the consensus of that group that some sort of farm parity and export subsidy payments must be appropriated during this session of Congress to aid the farmer in his problems.

It further was the opinion of the group that unless some bill was introduced which placed all phases of agriculture under a single protective measure, affecting all agricultural commodities and all sections of the Nation alike, that the chances for passage of any farm legislation at this session of the Congress would be slim indeed.

A subcommittee was appointed by the group, consisting of myself, as chairman, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] as members, to meet with a similar group of Senators from the cotton South in an attempt to agree upon some sort of unified legislation. The primary objective of both groups was to bring an understanding of agricultural needs to all Members of the Senate and to agricultural leaders in the House so that the program would not be jeopardized by lack of information or sectional prejudice.

This series of conferences resulted in two proposals being placed before the agricultural subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee. The sum of \$250,000,000 was established for farm parity payments, while a figure of \$150,000,000 was tentatively set for addition to the customs receipts for export subsidy and domestic aid to farmers in a multitude of occupations.

Among both groups there were those who thought that the figures thus tentatively set were perhaps too great. It was agreed, however, to throw both proposals before the agricultural subcommittee and to await the holding of hearings and the giving of testimony by experts in agricultural economics before any commitments were made as to what sums might merit support. Senators are all aware of what happened, as the bills are now before us for debate. The final figure for farm parity came out as \$225,000,000, while the subcommittee reported out \$113,000,000 for financial aid to section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

I now wish to digress for a moment and go back to something that transpired in the Senate a few days ago while I was absent, when the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] made some remarks upon the floor of the Senate which I deem it advisable just briefly to answer, because in these remarks it seems to me there is some intimation that the good faith on the part of those who are involved in this matter is somewhat questioned. I asked the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] to be present today in the Senate Chamber, but I understand he is out of the city and cannot be on the floor.

In his remarks on May 2, page 5026 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, among other things—and I would not discuss the entire speech and attempt to analyze it if it were not for a remark or two that the Senator made in connection with the farm program—the Senator from Wisconsin said:

It is very easy for us to forget that the \$60,000,000,000 American farm investment totters on the brink of financial annihilation. In Washington it is perilously simple for us to ignore the gaunt tanned man who swaps his toll in a losing barter, in which his rightful wage is lost in the shifting sands of commodity price levels.

In Washington it is too easy and too politic for us to become so engrossed in conciliating various pressure groups that we lose sight of the great basic industry of the country.

The distinguished Senator further said:

In Washington it is sometimes too expedient to play the farm interest "against the middle"; to stall one bill while another is introduced; to consider one isolated, completely unintegrated part of a program, independent from a coordinated program; and to stir the cauldron of farm cross-interest for political purposes rather than to settle the problem.

If the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has a solution of the farm problem he should present that solution to the United States Senate. I do not know of any bill that has been introduced by him since he has been in the Senate which seeks to solve the greatest problem of all before the United States Senate or in the House at the present time.

So far as stirring the cauldron for political purposes, if anyone will read the Senator's speech and not reach the conclusion that the Senator from Wisconsin was making a political speech for that very purpose, then he would reach a different conclusion from that reached by the senior Senator from Illinois.

The Senator from Wisconsin further said in his speech:

Several months ago, because every sector of our farm group had individual bills introduced, I suggested the need of a coordinated bill wherein every farm section would be represented. Nothing came of that suggestion.

If the Senator wanted to carry out the suggestion that he made to someone, prudence dictated that he introduce a bill to that effect. He is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Hearings could have been held upon this all-unified, so-called coordinated bill that he told someone, somewhere, at some time, something about.

The Senator further said:

Nothing came of that suggestion, so on the 28th of March I introduced an amendment to House bill 5269, calling for an appropriation of \$100,000,000, \$50,000,000 of which was to be used under section 32 of the A. A. Act to buy surplus butter.

He says, after his bill was introduced:

A conference was called, and some of the dairy and wheat farmers met in the office of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. In view of the fact that there has been some talk among Senators as to what went on, I am glad to state that the purpose of the meeting apparently was to see if a coordinated bill could not be worked out. As a result—

I want to assure the Senator his bill had nothing to do with the calling of the conference.

The Senator further says:

The Senator from Illinois was appointed chairman of a subcommittee, and he appointed the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] as members of the subcommittee.

In this he confused Senator CLARK of Idaho with Senator CLARK of Missouri.

He further states in the speech that he made in May:

I want to say that when meetings were held by it, apparently the subcommittee was to report back to the general committee. We have had no report so far as I know.

And he also stated in that speech that no Republican was appointed upon this particular committee.

Mr. President, when the committee was appointed, and when those from the Wheat, the Dairy, and the Corn Belts were called to the office of the senior Senator from Illinois, there was no thought of Democratic or Republican politics in connection with the unified, so-called broad program for all agriculture. There was only one thought in the mind of every man who was there, whether he was a Democrat, Progressive, or Republican, and that was, What can we do best at this particular time to aid the desperate situation in which agriculture finds itself at this very hour?

So far as reporting back to the Members who were present originally, and who represented the States in the North and the West, I think the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is probably the only one who will say that we did not have at least two subsequent meetings, at which what was done by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], and myself was reported in detail to the other Members, and they were asked for instructions as to what we should do further in connection with attempting to agree with the Senators from the South who represented the great Cotton Belt.

In conclusion upon that point, I will say that the Senator was wholly unfair in making the insinuation which he did that he was not being let in on the program. He was invited to every meeting along with all other Senators. He is the only one who has complained. In selecting the committee of three, I conferred with Senators of long experience and finally

I asked the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to be one of the members, because I thought he knew something about the dairy situation in his section of the country. I know that he has been in the Senate for a long time. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], and myself, without any thought of partisan politics whatsoever, attempted to work out a program which would satisfy the great majority of the Members of the Senate, in order that a bill having the full support of the great majority of the Members of the United States Senate might go back to the House of Representatives.

Leaving that question for a moment, I wish to discuss briefly for the RECORD what I understand the parity feature payment really does for the basic commodities which it affects. It will be recalled that last year a similar bill was passed by the Congress of the United States providing that the sum of \$212,000,000 should be used as parity payments. That bill provided that one-half the sum was to be distributed under section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and one-half under section 501 of the Price Adjustment Act of 1938. It was the unanimous thought of those meeting in the group that whatever appropriation was made at this particular time for parity payments, the distribution following the appropriation should be made upon the same basis as it was made last year.

At this point I should like to direct the attention of the Members of the Senate to what happened in the House of Representatives when a similar bill was being considered a few weeks ago. The very same language of the present act was introduced as an amendment to the present bill by a distinguished Member of the House, Mr. CANNON of Missouri. On a point of order it was held to be legislation upon an appropriation bill, and Mr. CANNON of Missouri conceded the point of order. Following that, he then offered the same amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and his committee, and no point of order was made against it, although the amendment was defeated by the House on a yea-and-nay vote.

I merely mention that fact for the reason that it makes a difference, on the question of payments, as to whether distribution is made strictly under section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act or whether one-half the amount be distributed under section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and one-half under section 501 of the Price Adjustment Act of 1938. I wish to put these figures into the RECORD so that if any people in the Corn Belt district of Illinois read my statement they will understand why it was impossible to use the same language in this bill as was used last year. However, the payments are practically the same, to all intents and purposes. For example, I have taken \$212,000,000, which was appropriated last year, and have had the Agricultural Department tell me what amount of the \$212,000,000 went in parity payments to producers of the five basic commodities.

Last year the actual amount received by corn producers in the commercial corn-producing area was \$61,613,000. Cotton producers received \$84,578,000; wheat producers received \$64,113,000; rice producers \$1,696,000; and tobacco producers nothing, because tobacco was bringing very nearly parity prices.

If the present formula should become law, in the distribution of the \$212,000,000—and I use \$212,000,000 merely because it is elemental and the change can be easily understood—under the parity payments, wheat would suffer more than any other commodity. I think the wheat farmer is entitled to know just how the amount would be broken down by the Agricultural Department. That is the reason why I am making this explanation at this particular time. Corn producers would receive \$64,143,000, which is about \$3,000,000 more than they received last year. Cotton producers would receive \$88,000,000, which is about three and a half million dollars more than they received last year. Wheat producers would receive \$57,447,000, which is about \$6,500,000 less than the wheat producers received last year. Rice producers would receive \$2,307,000, making a total of \$212,000,000.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GURNEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. FRAZIER. As I understood the figures, wheat producers would receive a little less than they received last year.

Mr. LUCAS. Wheat producers would receive a little less than they received last year, under the break-down of the Agricultural Department, when we consider the \$212,000,000. Perhaps they will not receive less, but figuring it on the basis of \$212,000,000, which we had last year, they would receive less.

Mr. FRAZIER. The trouble last year was that the loan value was practically the same as the price of wheat last fall. With the parity payments and the loan value, wheat producers are still far below their so-called parity price. The parity price is generally conceded to be below the cost of production. The trouble is that the appropriation is altogether too small. If the farmer is to make a profit or receive any income, he must receive at least the parity price, or in excess of the parity price. If he does not make a profit, he will go broke. So it seems to me that the appropriation should be higher than it is by a considerable amount.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the force of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. However, the question of cost was considered in the program, and while it is absolutely desirable from the standpoint of every basic commodity that ultimately we reach a parity payment for all commodities, I should like to direct the attention of the Senator from North Dakota to the fact that the wheat farmer is in a very little different position from that of other farmers so far as what he is receiving at the present time is concerned, as compared with the parity price. In my section there are wheat farmers as well as corn farmers. However, corn is selling today at 44 cents a bushel, which is 55 percent of parity. Cotton is selling at 8.3 cents per pound, which is 53 percent of parity. Wheat is selling at 56.7 cents a bushel, which is 51 percent of parity. Rice is selling at 63 cents a bushel, which is 62 percent of parity.

There is not a great discrepancy between those four basic commodities, and especially between wheat and corn and cotton. As of March 1939 there is only a 4-percent difference between the market prices and the parity prices of those products.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. I think, though, the Senator will agree that corn received considerably better consideration than did wheat or even cotton in regard to loans on those commodities last year.

Mr. LUCAS. I would not agree to that, and I will tell the Senator why. True it is, we got 56 cents a bushel for corn this year; but the great trouble with so many Senators, as with many other persons, is they forget that 85 percent of the corn raised in the corn commercial-producing area in this country is fed to cattle and hogs. From the one and a half billion bushels raised in the corn commercial-producing area there is just a little over 200,000,000 bushels of corn under seal at the present time. Of course, for this corn in the crib the owner obtained 56 cents per bushel plus the adjustment price.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. How much more is to be paid this year in the form of subsidies than was paid under the bill of last year?

Mr. LUCAS. In last year's bill we paid in parity payments \$212,000,000. This year we have increased the amount to \$225,000,000, and in a moment or two I am going to submit figures showing about what that will produce in the way of parity payments for the different commodities.



Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I mean all payments, including the conservation payments—the total subsidies.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, last year, I will say to the Senator from Minnesota, we appropriated \$500,000,000 for soil-conservation payments. It is my understanding that we only expended approximately \$300,000,000 of that \$500,000,000 on soil-conservation payments. In other words, while we appropriated \$500,000,000, the farmers only obtained some \$300,000,000 from the Department. Thereby we saved \$200,000,000 under the soil-conservation program of last year. That is one of the reasons why the Senator from Illinois is willing to do what he is doing in connection with the appropriations covered by the pending bill. I realize that is an increase for the farmer, but I also realize that, while we appropriated half a billion dollars last year, we actually paid out to the farmer only \$300,000,000, thereby saving \$200,000,000.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Are the \$200,000,000 in the Treasury?

Mr. LUCAS. No. As I understand it, that amount lapses.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. What was the total expenditure, then, for subsidies—\$300,000,000 and \$212,000,000, or \$512,000,000 in all? Was that it?

Mr. LUCAS. I think that is practically all. Insofar as the parity payments feature is concerned, and insofar as the payments made to cooperating farmers under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, we paid out just \$512,000,000 last year. How much these other items that we are discussing here today total on recapitulation of the whole, I cannot tell the Senator.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Does the Senator mean the total this year?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I mean last year.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Do the two items make the total of \$512,000,000? Was there any other subsidy paid last year?

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot tell the Senator, but I do not think so.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. We paid in subsidies last year 34 percent more than we paid in 1937, according to the records I have, and yet the farmers had 11 percent less income than they had in 1937 on the basis of present prices and benefits and conservation payments. Can the committee give us an estimate as to what the total income of the farmer will be this year, based on present prices?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I have no figures at hand, I will say to the Senator, which would enable me to answer that question?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I believe the record shows that in 1937 the farmers of the United States got \$3,000,000,000 less than they were entitled to under the theory of benefit and parity payments.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot agree with the Senator as to that; I do not think it was \$3,000,000,000; it may be so; but we are going just a little far afield of the question I had in mind, and I would not care to be drawn into a debate of that kind.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I am asking the question for the purpose of estimating, if we can, what will be the condition of the farmer at the end of this crop year when he shall have marketed his crops.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course the Senator's guess is, perhaps, just as good as mine, but I will say to the Senator from Minnesota that unless we enact this proposed legislation the condition of the farmer will be much worse in the final analysis. Whether or not there ought to be more legislation for him is something that I am not going to discuss here today. I know that there are other farm bills pending at the present time; certain phases of those bills have some merit, indeed, much merit; but that is a separate proposition that should come up later. However, so far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, I want to see the Triple A have a fair chance before it is repealed or before some other farm act takes its place. Those who advocate today the repeal of the Triple A—and some are doing it now in speeches throughout the country—are going to meet a serious challenge at the hands of some of the best agricultural minds

of the country unless they can give them a constructive program as a substitute for the Triple A and not merely words or platitudes for selfish and political reasons. The Triple A has only been on the statute books since February a year ago, and last year in my State only 50 percent of the farmers cooperated. I am happy to say to the Senator and especially to the Senator from Minnesota, who has brought up this discussion, that in Illinois this year at least 85 percent or perhaps 90 percent of the farmers are cooperating with the Triple A. On May 1 approximately 170,000 farmers in my State had signed up with the program, indicating that at least they have given the Triple A very close and serious consideration. I undertake to say that the farm program is not so unpopular as many people ask us to believe it to be. It is not perfect, by any means; but it is a good start.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I was not criticizing the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I know the Senator was not.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I asked the questions for information, because I am anxious to know if we can have some hope that the farmer will be better off at the end of this year than he has been at the end of every other year since 1929?

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, legislation alone is not going to tell the story for the farmer. Many things can happen and many things have happened in the past because, in my opinion, of the lack of proper legislation.

What is the cause of the cotton situation today? Back in 1934 the Supreme Court, in my humble opinion, tortured the Constitution in order to invalidate the first farm program under this administration. For 2 years thereafter we had no control. I am one of those who believe we must control chronic surpluses of the basic commodities of this country until some genius, some statesman, some economist comes along and finds a method of distribution. It irks me to say that we ought to control the acreage of corn and wheat and cotton when I see so many people suffering in this country, but, as a farm owner in Illinois and one who has been vitally interested in this program since I was a boy, I saw in 1932 ruin and misery and suffering and sorrow brought to thousands upon thousands of farmers in my State because of chronic surpluses. The Triple A, in my opinion, was the answer, and just as it was doing constructive work for the farmers of America and constructive work for society as a whole it was invalidated by the Supreme Court, and then for 2 years we had just the soil-conservation program, with no control. That is when the cotton South produced so many bales of cotton; that is when 80,000,000 acres were planted to wheat in Kansas, as well as in my own State and other States, and drove wheat down to the price where it then was. I am a firm believer in proper control. I am honest in my adherence to that philosophy. I may be wrong, but no one yet, either in the Senate or House, has convinced me that the program of control is wrong.

Mr. President, I move on just a little further in the discussion. I want to put into the Record another set of figures dealing with the same \$212,000,000. This set of figures is based on an estimate of production and prices that may or may not happen. In other words, using the 1938 production for cotton, corn, rice, and tobacco and the 1938 season average prices through July 31, 1939, for rice and tobacco, a wheat production of 750,000,000 bushels, cotton priced at 8 cents a pound, a wheat price of 60 cents per bushel, a corn price of 40 cents per bushel, and taking \$225,000,000 in this example as an illustration of what might happen in the way of more or less income from such an amount in the event the price of any of these commodities rose and fell, I am taking cotton at a price that will bring \$86,818,000; taking corn at a price that will bring \$75,000,000; wheat, \$58,000,000; rice, \$2,000,000, and tobacco, \$1,501,000.

Assuming for the sake of argument that corn selling at 40 cents a bushel produces \$75,834,000 under the parity payment feature, if corn is selling at 50 cents a bushel instead of getting \$75,834,000 the corn farmer will get only \$59,206,000, and the difference between \$75,834,000 and \$59,206,000 will be distributed throughout the other basic commodities, and they will advance. Cotton will go from \$86,000,000 to \$96,000,000; wheat, from \$58,000,000 to \$65,000,000; rice, from \$2,194,000 to \$2,438,000, and tobacco from \$1,500,000 to \$1,600,000.

In the event corn is selling for 55 cents a bushel, corn will further take a decrease on parity payments of \$10,000,000, which will give corn \$49,000,000 under the program, and give cotton \$102,000,000; wheat, \$69,000,000; rice, \$2,500,000, and tobacco, \$1,700,000. Any other commodity that either falls or rises in price will be reflected in the same manner as the example I have given of corn; and in the event corn reaches 60 cents a bushel the corn farmer and the corn commercial producing area will not get a single dime of the \$225,000,000, because the farmer will be getting 75 percent of the parity price, and the other commodities which have not reached 75 percent will get the benefit of the amount corn did not get because of its market price. If all commodities should reach 75 percent of parity the program would cost the Government nothing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place these two tables in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, in order that I may give the Senate the benefit of them.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Distribution of \$212,000,000 based on 1938 production and prices*

	Actual distribution under the Price Adjustment Act of 1938	Distribution that would have been made under Price Adjustment Act of 1938 if that act had provided for using sec. 303 alone instead of secs. 104 and 303
Corn, commercial.....	\$61,613,000	\$64,143,000
Cotton.....	84,578,000	88,040,000
Wheat.....	64,113,000	57,447,000
Rice.....	1,696,000	2,370,000
Tobacco.....	0	0
Total.....	212,000,000	212,000,000

*Distribution of \$225,000,000 among basic commodities under sec. 303*  
[Based on assumed production and prices as described below]

Commodity	A	B	C
Cotton.....	\$86,818,000	\$96,494,000	\$102,190,000
Corn, commercial.....	75,834,000	59,206,000	49,421,000
Wheat.....	58,653,000	65,192,000	69,039,000
Rice.....	2,194,000	2,438,000	2,581,000
Tobacco.....	1,501,000	1,670,000	1,769,000
Total.....	225,000,000	225,000,000	225,000,000

A: Using 1938 production for cotton, corn, rice, and tobacco and 1938 season average prices through Jan. 31, 1939, for rice and tobacco; wheat production 750,000,000 bushels; cotton price 8 cents per pound; wheat price 60 cents per bushel; corn price 40 cents per bushel.

B: Same as A except corn price at 50 cents per bushel.

C: Same as A except corn price at 55 cents per bushel.

NOTE.—With 75 percent of parity as a maximum limitation and tobacco prices as high as in 1938, the funds shown above for tobacco would be redistributed to the other commodity, or commodities, for which 1939 prices are the lowest in relation to parity.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I now desire to discuss, just briefly, the \$113,000,000 which I hope will be appropriated by the Senate, which under the language of the pending bill is to be distributed under the provisions of section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

There is a very good reason for this additional appropriation. In fact, there are a number of reasons; but No. 1 is that the customs receipts coming in under section 32, under the 30-percent clause, are the lowest that they have been for many, many years. I am advised that all we shall get from customs receipts to use under section 32 this year is around \$90,000,000, and if this bill passes and we appropriate

another \$113,000,000 the Agricultural Department will have a total of \$203,000,000 to allocate under section 32.

I have here a rough guess as to how that amount will be broken down. This is based upon the testimony which was given before the committee, as well as some statements which were made before the committee consisting of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], and myself. There is nothing binding about this estimate, but I thought the Senate and the country should know in close proximity what each particular commodity probably would get.

Under section 32 no commodity could get more than 25 percent of the total amount that comes from the customs receipts and the total amount that is appropriated under this bill. Therefore, dairy products, for instance, under the domestic-consumption phase of the problem, would receive perhaps \$50,000,000; meats, primarily hogs, would get around \$18,000,000; poultry and eggs would get around \$6,000,000; fruits and vegetables would get around \$35,000,000; making a total of \$109,000,000. Under the export-subsidy theory of section 32, cotton would get around \$50,000,000; wheat around \$26,000,000; lard around \$16,000,000; and pecans and walnuts around \$2,000,000; making a grand total of \$203,000,000. There might be a slight change here or there; but that break-down is close to being correct, if I correctly analyze the testimony, and take it into consideration with the statements which have been heretofore made to the committee.

Mr. President, in conclusion, no one realizes better than I that a tremendous sum of money is involved in this appropriation; and yet day after day I have seen the Appropriations Committee come in with this bill or that, calling for billions upon billions of dollars for practically every conceivable thing in this country.

We voted billions for national defense, and I went along with that program and was glad to do it. No one ever raised the question as to where the money was coming from to pay the billions of dollars. As a Member of the House of Representatives, I voted for every dollar that was ever requested for every W. P. A. appropriation year after year, and I voted for some appropriations in the Senate this year; and yet because I dared vote against an additional \$150,000,000 in the original vote on W. P. A., I have been considered by some persons out in my section of the country as one who has no heart; as an individual who was attempting to trample down into the dust the rights of those who may be suffering for want of the necessities of life.

It is a strange thing how quickly people forget. It is a strange thing that no one ever thought of all the money I had voted for up to that time and said, "Well, LUCAS deserves just a little consideration at least for going along on all of those appropriations"; but that one thing stands out in the minds of those who want more and more all the time.

Yes, this is a large appropriation; and the question is frequently asked upon the floor of the Senate and in the lobbies, "Where are we going with all of these appropriations? When are we to stop, if ever?" I am frank to say that I have not the answer, and I do not know whether any Senator upon the floor has an answer. Sometimes, as we deliberate over the boxcar figures involved in appropriations in the Senate, I find that it does me good to hark back to the days when one dollar—one three hundred and thirty-eight millionth part of the sum involved in this bill—represented to me perhaps several hours of back-breaking toil and represented also food and sustenance for several days.

So when we discuss these sums with strings of zeros stretching out ad infinitum I try to remember two fundamental principles which, to my knowledge, have not been repealed. Admitting my shortcomings as an economist—I scarcely ever agree with the economists, because they cannot agree among themselves—but, admitting my shortcomings as an economist, the first is that a dollar is not a figment of the imagination nor something that can be wished into existence; it must be created through labor or productivity or natural wealth. The second is that you cannot spend what you do not have, at least not after your creditors catch up with you.



Easy, indeed, would it be, and perhaps expedient, to say to the farmers of America, "Here is the money we have appropriated for you to aid you in your present troubles. Just come and get it, and don't worry about a thing." My approach is slightly different. While I do not desire to be unpleasant, I must remind the farmers of America that this money is being appropriated in their behalf, but that in some way, somehow, a method must be found of raising it. Therefore, at the earliest opportunity, if this bill becomes a law, I may introduce a measure which will provide for a means of financing this appropriation.

The tax collector is never a popular fellow, but I believe the time has come when it must be impressed upon the persons who are the recipients of Federal munificence that the appropriations which are voted in their behalf are not just manufactured out of thin air. I believe that the same principle which I learned in my youth as an individual, that you cannot spend what you do not have or what you have not a reasonable expectancy of getting, applies equally well to corporations and to governments and to individuals.

It is not that I believe that the farmer is not fully as deserving of Federal aid as are the destitute and hungry residents of the cities and industrial centers. Certainly, too, the importance of American agriculture in our economic system justifies appropriating funds for the American farmer just as funds have been appropriated for the aid of industry and commerce.

But if, after having lived among farm folk all my life, I am any judge of the temper of agricultural thought, the American farmer does not seek, and would not want, a so-called hand-out. As a class, he is jealous of his economic and social integrity, and all he asks is for temporary aid to pull him through a situation that was not of his making.

Finally, I think the proposed legislation will go far to avert more drastic, and perhaps less feasible, measures which might be hatched and nurtured unless the economic needs of the American farmer are at least partially satisfied at this particular time. As between the alternatives of ignoring the farm problem completely or following some visionary course which might prove economically disastrous, I prefer to follow this sound middle pathway, which I believe to be just and well considered.

My plea is to pass these proposed appropriations so that, aided by the legislative machinery which already has been set up in his behalf, the American farmer may work out his own salvation, under the necessary protection of crop control, and with as few other restrictions as are compatible with sound economic sense.

It is not a question, gentlemen, which can be determined if partisan or sectional considerations are allowed to creep into the debates. The broad scope of American agriculture provides a huge, all-inclusive panorama of complicated problems and needs and, as I see our duty here today, it is to vote these funds so that agriculture may move forward with, and neither retard nor be retarded by, labor and industry and government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 97, after line 4, to insert:

#### DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry out the provisions of section 32, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935, and subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, \$113,000,000. Such sum shall be immediately available and shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, other appropriations made by such section or for the purpose of such section: *Provided*, That not in excess of 25 percent of the funds herein made available may be devoted to any one agricultural commodity.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the Senator from Georgia whether or not I received a correct impression as to this matter earlier in the day. The pending amendment provides an appropriation for the disposal of

surplus commodities of \$113,000,000. I understand that for this same purpose there is available 30 percent of the customs revenues under the provisions of section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. A year ago section 32 produced \$144,000,000, and it is anticipated that this year it will produce only \$90,000,000. Last year there was no appropriation for this purpose other than the money provided by section 32. Am I correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The understanding of the Senator from Colorado is correct. It might be stated that this is the first time Congress has considered an appropriation of any amount over and above the 30 percent that is permanently allocated from the customs receipts. Of course, the allocation does not run with the fiscal year, it runs with the calendar year, so at the time this matter is under consideration Congress knows the amount which will be available under the permanent legislation which makes this allocation. The calendar year from January 1 to December 31 is used in determining the amount which will be available for expenditure under section 32. Therefore we know now that the sum will be approximately \$90,000,000 in round figures.

Mr. ADAMS. Last year the \$144,000,000 was adequate for these purposes?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will not say it was wholly adequate, but no great harm has resulted from lack of funds.

Mr. ADAMS. So that if the same demand existed this year, and the \$144,000,000 were substantially just enough, there would be a shortage of \$54,000,000 this year, and the necessity of equalizing?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would require an appropriation of \$54,000,000 to bring the section 32 funds up to the exact amount available during the current year. However, the Department pointed out that there would be more demand for section 32 funds in the coming fiscal year than has been made upon them for the current fiscal year.

Mr. ADAMS. Of course, there are almost always endless demands. Every group of producers, when the price of their commodity declines, is anxious to have the Surplus Commodities Corporation take over the surplus in order to reduce the amount on the market. That is a normal situation. I have seen it in my own State and elsewhere.

The point I was reaching was that it seems that under conditions this year, which are certainly no less favorable than the conditions of last year, we are providing \$59,000,000 more than was available last year. Why could we not reduce the \$113,000,000 to the amount which would equalize last year's situation and make the appropriation \$59,000,000 instead of \$113,000,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, several reasons were assigned by the witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee as to why adding the amount of \$59,000,000, making a total of \$144,000,000 available under section 32, would not be adequate.

This year the Department has had in operation what was known as a wheat export program, whereby 100,000,000 bushels of wheat have been shipped abroad and subsidized out of Department of Agriculture funds. Those funds were taken from the soil-conservation appropriation, approximately \$23,000,000 from the soil-conservation program appropriation. This year, due to the fact that the percentage of cooperators under the soil-conservation program has increased tremendously, there will be no funds available from the soil-conservation funds. There was another item of some \$4,000,000 which had been used from soil-conservation funds for carrying on a peanut program, which will not be available this year, thereby making it necessary to finance the peanut program from section 32 funds.

Perhaps overshadowing those two items, which make about \$25,000,000 of funds which will be added to the expenditures under section 32, there is a situation of extreme gravity in the dairy industry. I am not sure that I thoroughly understand all of the details of the dairy program, but a large amount of money has been loaned by the Commodity Credit Corporation on butter, and that butter is now in storage.

The section 32 funds, up until the time they were exhausted, were used to purchase this butter and distribute it among those on the relief rolls. Section 32 funds having become exhausted, the Department estimates that it will require something like \$15,000,000 between now and the beginning of the next fiscal year to clear up the butter situation.

Mr. ADAMS. That is, for one agency of the Government to buy it from another agency of the Government?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; because the Commodity Credit Corporation makes loans to cooperatives. They borrow on the butter, and another bureau of the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, purchases it from the cooperators, who are holding it under a Government loan. It is not a direct purchase from another agency of government.

I am sure that the diligent Senator from Colorado, with his usual care, has examined the hearings. He will find in them that the Surplus Commodity Corporation has pointed out that a very critical situation will exist in the poultry industry, both as regards the marketing of poultry and of eggs. In addition, a considerable surplus in lard is anticipated for the coming year, and that it is proposed to inaugurate an export program on a small amount of lard for which money is not available, and will not be available unless the funds applied to section 32 are increased.

In addition to that, if a cotton export subsidy program is adopted, additional funds will be required to carry on that program. If the comprehensive program outlined by the Department of Agriculture is to go into effect \$113,000,000, in addition to the \$90,000,000 permanently allocated, is necessary. The Department felt that it would need that much to reach all of these phases of agriculture, many of which are not covered by the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

The situation in the fruit and vegetable production is very unfavorable. It was anticipated it would be necessary to buy a considerable amount of apples and grapefruit and oranges to avoid a glut in the market and disastrous prices to the producer.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the Senator then feels that the Department of Agriculture has imposed upon it the duty to say that wherever there is a surplus of any agricultural product the Government should step in and take the surplus off the market?

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not go that far, but I would say that there is a very definite obligation on the Congress of the United States to endeavor to protect, as far as possible, the prices received by the producers of any kind of agricultural commodity in the United States.

Mr. ADAMS. Would the Senator go so far on the other side as to say that whenever there is a shortage in commodities so that the consumer is forced to pay more than a reasonable price that the Government should step in and see that the prices are brought down to a reasonable level?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Colorado is getting out in rather deep water. I do not know how the Government could embark on any such program under normal circumstances. If I recall correctly, during the period of the World War, however, the Government did undertake to establish a level above which prices for wheat, corn, and other agricultural products should not mount.

Mr. ADAMS. I am not speaking entirely off the book, because there is one agricultural product which is raised in the State of the Senator from Louisiana and the State of the Senator from Colorado with respect to which Congress, through the activities of the Secretary of Agriculture, is endeavoring to keep the price down. I refer to sugar. Congress has placed in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture a power which he has exercised with great liberality—to keep the price down for the benefit of the consumer. So when I make the inquiry, I wonder why the same power and the same objective might not be instituted in connection with other products which the consumer has to purchase.

Mr. RUSSELL. When Senators representing the sugar-producing regions stated to the Senate that that was the case the Senate immediately, forthwith, passed a bill to

remedy the situation and to protect the American producer. The pending bill seeks the same objective—to protect the American producer of agricultural commodities against disastrously low prices. When the Senate has done all within its power to aid the American farmer, we have discharged our responsibility.

Mr. ADAMS. In view of the Senator's explanation I will not offer the amendment I had in mind to offer.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee. Will the \$113,000,000 be the fund from which the Department of Agriculture would furnish groceries under the provisions for the stamp method of providing lower-price commodities to people on the relief rolls?

Mr. RUSSELL. It will be. That will be the source from which that program will be financed. The Senator from Oklahoma understands, of course, that during the coming year we do not propose to try out that program except on an experimental basis.

Mr. LEE. I understand that. I should like somewhere to amend the plan so that all those who are certified for relief can enjoy it, as well as those who are actually on the rolls. For instance, in Oklahoma we have 30,000 persons who are certified for the relief rolls, but not enough money to employ them. We have only enough to employ 65,000 persons. There are 30,000 who are certified as being in a similar condition as the 65,000. The 65,000 get jobs, but the 30,000 do not get jobs nor the stamps. I am wondering if there is a place in the bill where we could provide that all those who are certified for relief could enjoy this lower price.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, may I interrupt at that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. ADAMS. I think perhaps there is a little confusion in the mind of the Senator from Oklahoma, if I understood him correctly. As I understand, the surplus commodities are not given to those on Federal relief rolls. They are given to the States. They are distributed by the States to those who are upon the direct relief rolls. The direct relief rolls may include a part or all those to whom the Senator from Oklahoma refers as certified, but not upon the Federal rolls. The Federal roll is made up of those who are receiving the security wage. The surplus commodities are given to the State for distribution to those to whom it extends direct relief, which may be the unemployable, it may be the disabled, or may be those who are employable but not able to get employment.

Mr. LEE. That is correct. I thank the Senator from Colorado. The point I had in mind, however, is the experiment the Department is making with different colored stamps. "All I know is what I read in the papers." In the papers it said that those on relief would be given these stamps, which would exclude those who have been certified for relief but not been put on relief. As this experiment is carried out I should like to see it extended to include those who have been certified for relief, because they need it worse than those who get the jobs and also the tickets.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in the proposed plan I do not think there is any discrimination against a man who is certified for relief and who is unable to get upon the W. P. A. rolls. Of course, that is not a matter upon which we can legislate in the pending bill. But if I understand the stamp program, it will not necessarily interfere with the distribution of surplus commodities. It merely means that when those who are on the relief rolls are paid, if they will accept their compensation in stamps they will receive more payment in stamps than they would in money. That is done to encourage the consumption of those surplus commodities. But in the meanwhile, where purchases have been made, those commodities will be distributed as they have been heretofore.

Of course, it will be very unfair to the man who is on direct relief and unable to get on the W. P. A. rolls to deny him any benefits in the distribution of surplus commodities, merely because he has no stamps, and if the Department of Agriculture has not given any attention to that phase of



the program it certainly should do so at the very earliest date; otherwise there would be a very unfair discrimination against the man on direct relief. He would be denied not only an opportunity to work on the W. P. A. but would be denied sharing in the distribution of these surplus commodities.

Mr. ADAMS. I think there is one thing regarding the surplus commodities which is a little difficult to work out. There may be a surplus of onions raised in a valley in a State, and the Surplus Commodities Corporation then has on hand a great supply of onions. It may be the only surplus, so those on relief there are supplied with onions. In California the surplus may be prunes. In Florida and in the South there may be a great surplus of grapefruit, as we had one year. In other words, there is a difficulty in the matter of distribution of surplus commodities, because in one place it is one particular commodity and in another place another commodity. I assume that the Surplus Commodity Corporation endeavors to work it out, but I do not know what the answer is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 96, line 14.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Farm Tenant Act, farm tenancy", on page 99, line 14, after the word "Act", to strike out "\$24,984,500" and insert "\$49,984,500", and in line 15, before the word "together", to insert "reimbursable", so as to read:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia, and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding, as authorized by said act, \$49,984,500 reimbursable, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation made under said act for the fiscal year 1939.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 100, after line 10, to insert:

Total, Farm Tenant Act, \$56,950,230.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Water facilities, arid and semiarid areas," on page 100, line 23, after the word "elsewhere," to strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$500,000," so as to read:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act to promote conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States by aiding in the development of facilities for water storage and utilization, and for other purposes," approved August 28, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 590r-590x), including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; printing and binding; the purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles; and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, \$500,000, of which not to exceed \$25,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Beltsville Research Center," on page 101, line 13, after the word "expenses," to strike out "\$35,000" and insert "\$90,000," so as to read:

For general administrative purposes, including maintenance, operation, repairs, and other expenses, \$90,000; and, in addition thereto, this appropriation may be augmented, by transfer of funds or by reimbursement, from applicable appropriations, to cover the cost, including handling and other related charges, of services and supplies, equipment and materials furnished, stores of which may be maintained at the center, and to cover the cost of building construction, alteration, and repair performed by the center in carrying out the purposes of such applicable appropriations and the applicable appropriations may also be charged their proportionate share of the necessary general expenses of the center not covered by this appropriation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Cooperative farm forestry", on page 102, line 10, after the word "improvements", to strike out "\$300,000" and insert "\$400,000", so as to read:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18,

1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b), including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; printing and binding; not to exceed \$7,700 for the purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles; the purchase of reference books and technical journals; not to exceed \$20,000 for the construction or purchase of necessary buildings, and other improvements, \$400,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Forest roads and trails", on page 102, line 24, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$14,000,000"; on page 103, line 2, before the word "Stat.", to insert "49"; in line 3, before the word "of", to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$7,000,000"; in line 7, after the word "rental", to insert a comma and "purchase, or construction"; and in line 10, after the word "maintenance", to insert a comma and "but the total cost of any such building purchased or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed \$7,500", so as to read:

For carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921 (23 U. S. C. 23), including not to exceed \$59,500 for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia, \$14,000,000, which sum consists of the balance of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1939 by the act approved June 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1520), and \$7,000,000 of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1940 by the act approved June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 635), to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase, or construction of buildings necessary for the storage of equipment and supplies used for road and trail construction and maintenance, but the total cost of any such building purchased or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Farm Credit Administration, salaries and expenses", on page 107, line 23, before the word "together", to strike out "\$3,600,000" and insert "\$3,700,000", so as to read:

For salaries and expenses of the Farm Credit Administration in the District of Columbia and the field; traveling expenses of officers and employees including not to exceed \$5,000 for travel incurred under proper authority attending meetings or conventions of members of organizations at which matters of importance to the work of the Farm Credit Administration are to be discussed or transacted; printing and binding; contingent and miscellaneous expenses, including law books, books of reference, and not to exceed \$1,000 for periodicals, newspapers, and maps; contract stenographic reporting services, and expert services for the preparation of amortization tables; library membership fees or dues in organizations which issue publications to members only or to members at a lower price than to others, payment for which may be made in advance; purchase of manuscripts, data, and special reports by personal service without regard to the provisions of any other act; procurement of supplies and services without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$50; purchase (including one at not to exceed \$1,500), exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles and motortrucks to be used only for official purposes; typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices, including their repair and exchange; garage rental in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; payment of actual transportation expenses and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Farm Credit Administration; employment of persons, firms, and others for the performance of special services, including legal services, and other miscellaneous expenses; necessary administrative expenses in connection with the making of loans under the provisions of the act of January 29, 1937 (50 Stat. 5), and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans made under the provisions of the acts of March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1347), March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 467), April 26, 1924 (43 Stat. 110), February 28, 1927 (44 Stat. 1251), February 25, 1929 (45 Stat. 1306), as amended May 17, 1929 (46 Stat. 3), March 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 78, 79), December 20, 1930 (46 Stat. 1022), February 14, 1931 (46 Stat. 1160), and February 23, 1931 (46 Stat. 1276); January 22, 1932 (47 Stat. 5), February 4, 1933 (47 Stat. 795), March 4, 1933 (47 Stat. 1547), February 23, 1934 (48 Stat. 354), March 10, 1934 (48 Stat. 402), June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1021), February 20, 1935 (49 Stat. 28), March 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 49), April 8, 1935 (49 Stat. 115), January 29, 1937 (50 Stat. 5), February 9, 1937 (50 Stat. 8, 11), February 4, 1938 (52 Stat. 26), and Executive Order No. 7305, dated February 28, 1936; examination of corporations, banks, associations, credit unions, and institutions operated, supervised, or regulated by the Farm Credit Administration: *Provided*, That the expenses and salaries of employees engaged in such examinations shall be assessed against the said corporations, banks, or institutions in accordance with the provisions of existing laws; in all, \$3,700,000, together with not to exceed \$3,950,000

from the funds made available to the Farm Credit Administration under the acts of January 29, 1937 (50 Stat. 5), February 9, 1937 (50 Stat. 8, 11), and February 4, 1938 (52 Stat. 26).

The amendment was agreed to.

That concludes the committee amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. I desire to offer from the floor a legislative amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read. The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 108, line 15, before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That no employee of the United States on whose certificate or approval loans under said act of January 29, 1937, as amended, or other acts of the same general character, are or have been made, shall be held personally liable for any loss or deficiency occasioned by the fraud or misrepresentation of applicants or borrowers, if the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration shall determine that such employee has exercised reasonable care in the circumstances, and has complied with the regulations of the Farm Credit Administration in executing such certificate or giving such approval."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this amendment grew out of a ruling by the Comptroller General that a representative of the Crop Production Loan Agency, commonly called the Seed Loan Agency, was personally liable for any fraud or misrepresentation on the part of the borrower. We are familiar with the set-up of the Crop Production Loan Agency. A local committee in each county passes on the loans. The representative of the Farm Credit Administration merely handles the mechanics of making the loan after it has been approved by the local committee. The Comptroller General's ruling would make the representative of the Government liable for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of a borrower whom the agent had never seen. The Farm Credit Administration has asked to have this language inserted, which leaves to the determination of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration the question whether or not the agent of the Government should be held liable in cases of fraud on the part of the borrower.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that concludes all the amendments which have been approved by the committee, or which the committee has requested me to offer from the floor. If the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has no objection, I suggest that the remainder of the bill might go over until tomorrow. Many other amendments remain to be offered from the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is agreeable.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

#### PARITY PRICES AND PARITY INCOME—ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE CANNON OF MISSOURI

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, one of the best statements I have heard or read on the subject of parity—parity prices and parity income—was recently made by Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, in a radio address delivered on April 8, last. Mr. CANNON is the ranking majority member of the House Committee on Appropriations and is chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When in the closing days of the Fifty-fifth Congress it was announced that for the first time in the history of the United States appropriations for all departments of the Government for 2 years had reached a grand total of a billion dollars, head lines flashed the news from coast to coast and editorials in every metropolitan newspaper in the Nation commented apprehensively on a billion-dollar Congress.

This session of Congress the Committee on Appropriations reported out a bill carrying an appropriation in excess of a billion

dollars for 1 year only and for one department of the Government alone—the Department of Agriculture. And the newspapers had very little to say about it.

A billion dollars for agriculture, but perhaps that is the explanation of the lack of editorial interest. For when you come to examine this long bill with its hundreds of items and millions of dollars you discover that the term "agricultural appropriation bill" is largely a misnomer and highly misleading and that while it is known as the agricultural appropriation bill, as a matter of fact a large part of the money it appropriates is for other than agricultural purposes.

For example, the bill carries \$6,000,000 for the Weather Bureau, of only incidental service to agriculture, and now maintained chiefly for the benefit of the civil and military air service. Seven million dollars for the eradication of tuberculosis and kindred stock diseases, primarily for the protection of the health of consumers; \$5,000,000 for meat inspection, a service for the exclusive benefit of the packers and middlemen, through its guaranty of quality and wholesomeness to the general public. Approximately \$20,000,000 for the forestry service, not even a branch of agriculture, consumed principally in the protection and development of national forests and national resources. Four million dollars for the Bureau of Biological Survey, the conservation of wildlife, a national interest, demand for which comes in greater volume and insistence from the city than the country. Nearly \$200,000,000 for the Bureau of Public Roads, a most laudable activity, but one in which the farmer is no more interested than any other citizen—in fact, out of this amount a wholly inadequate sum is provided for farm-to-market roads—connecting the farm with the great system of interurban highways for which most of this money is spent. Two and a half million dollars for the Food and Drug Administration which deals with food as it leaves the processors and not as it leaves the farm, and with cosmetics, etc., of secondary importance on the farm, and at most of no more benefit to the farmer than to any other industry. Ten million dollars for forest roads and trails, spent largely in the national forests and of practically no agricultural benefit whatever. And similar items throughout the bill—too numerous to mention.

So, when prompted to comment on the size of the agricultural appropriation bill, and the amount it carries, it is well to remember, that a large part of it is far from being agricultural, and is to be charged, neither to the farmer nor the farm.

But such items serve to make the bill, already of surpassing importance, probably the most widely discussed of all the supply bills, affecting directly and immediately every congressional district, directly or indirectly every interest and industry in the Nation, urban and rural, field and factory, farm and city.

In this connection, there is sometimes a tendency to confuse the jurisdiction and functions of two great committees of the House, the Committee on Agriculture, a legislative committee which cannot report appropriations, and the Committee on Appropriations, exclusively an appropriating committee which cannot report legislation. In other words, the Committee on Agriculture writes the farm laws, establishes the farm programs. And the Committee on Appropriations furnishes the money to operate those laws and put these farm programs into effect. Without money to run them farm programs are like guns without ammunition or automobiles without gas. And the Committee on Appropriations, in the agricultural appropriation bill, furnishes the ammunition and the gas, supplies the money, to make the mare go.

Let us take a concrete instance. The Seventy-fifth Congress passed the Farm Act of 1938, directing that the farmers of the country be paid parity prices for their products. But the law meant nothing—and the farmer's prices were not affected—until the Committee on Appropriations put through an appropriation providing the money to make the law operative.

What is a parity price? I suppose so much has been written and said about parity prices, and there has been such exhaustive debate in Congress on farm parity for the last 20 years, that everybody understands that a parity price for wheat, corn, cotton, eggs, and other farm products is a price which will make the farmer's wheat, corn, cotton, and eggs today buy as much as the same wheat, corn, cotton, and eggs would have bought before the war.

Everybody will remember that before the war the price of farm products and the price of manufactured products, wages for farm labor and wages for union labor were fairly adjusted, and, under the price schedules of that day, agriculture was on a plane of economic equality with labor and industry. Then came the war, and all prices advanced. Farm prices went up. Industrial prices went up. Wage scales went up, went up together, to the highest peak in the economic history of the country. And everybody was satisfied, everybody had purchasing power, everybody had enough and to spare, everybody was prosperous—on the farm and in the city.

But with the close of the war a surprising thing happened, a thing as unfair and unjust and inequitable as it was surprising. The bottom fell out of farm prices, while the prices of everything the farmer had to buy remained at wartime levels. Hogs fell from \$28 to \$2. Wheat went down from \$2.40 to 30 cents. Eggs dropped from 60 cents to 8 cents. And everything else in proportion. Now, that would not have been so bad if the price of everything that went up with farm prices had come down with farm prices. But, incredible as it may seem, while agriculture was falling labor and industry not only maintained wartime levels but advanced, until today it costs more to ship 45-cent corn than it cost to ship \$1.50 corn in 1920, costs more to ship 9-cent cotton than it cost to ship



35-cent cotton during the war, takes more to buy a binder to cut 60-cent wheat than it took to buy a binder to cut \$2.40 wheat. And today, when pork is \$7 and eggs are 20 cents, the union wage scale is higher than when pork was \$28 and eggs were 60 cents. Do our friends who wear cotton clothing and who eat ham and eggs approve of that discrepancy?

Now, do not misunderstand us. The farmer does not object to increases in either wages or prices. The farmer believes in high wages and high prices. But he submits to all fair-minded Americans that if he pays high wages for the products of labor and high prices for the output of industry he is entitled to an honest wage for his labor and a fair price for his products. That is what a parity is—as fair a price for what the farmer sells as the farmer must pay for what he buys.

And the justice of that contention is so obvious that all political parties have promised parity in their national platforms. And the Seventy-fifth Congress at last wrote into law a provision to pay parity prices.

But such laws are of no effect until money is provided to make them operative. They are, as has been said, like guns without ammunition or automobiles without gas. So the Committee on Appropriations last year provided \$212,000,000 and this year reported out \$250,000,000 for parity prices. These amounts are not sufficient to give the farmer full parity, but they are steps in the right direction.

From the \$212,000,000 appropriated last year the farmers of the Nation will receive 11 cents a bushel more for wheat than they have already been paid, 6 cents a bushel more for corn, and nearly 2 cents a pound more for cotton on their 1938 crop, payable this coming September and October. And if the \$250,000,000 appropriation is made they will receive as much or more for their 1939 crop, payable in 1940. We had a hard fight on parity in the House and lost by a vote of 191 to 204. Six votes would have changed it. But if the Senate adds it to the bill—and the country supports us—we have enough votes to pass it when it comes back to the House in conference, and to spare.

And industry and labor will profit as well as agriculture. The day these checks reach the farm the cash registers will begin to ring in every business in the community, orders will start flowing to the factories, and labor will be called back on the job. On the other hand, by inverse ratio, when farm prices fall, farm buying power drops, factories close, and labor is out of a job. Agriculture and labor and industry are all in the same boat. We must sink or swim, together.

And let it never be forgotten that when hogs were \$28 and eggs were 60 cents, there was not a single hungry child in America; and when hogs were \$2 and eggs were 8 cents, famine stalked like a grim specter through alley and lane, and bread lines formed and soup kitchens opened in every city in the Nation.

My friends, farm parity means business parity. A square deal for agriculture is a square deal for labor and industry. And inevitably, irrevocably, inexorably farm prosperity is national prosperity.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GURNEY in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS OF GRADUATING MIDSHIPMEN

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the President of the United States today sent to the Senate the nominations of the members of the graduating class at the Naval Academy to be ensigns in the Navy. Since the list of nominations, if printed in the RECORD, would require three full pages, and would have to appear twice in the RECORD and once in the calendar, while if the Senate confirms the nominations now they will appear once in the RECORD as having been confirmed, as a formal matter I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of the midshipmen of the graduating class at the Naval Academy to be ensigns in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DANAHER (for Mr. CONNALLY), from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Stephen J. Doyle, of North Dakota, to be United States marshal for the district of North Dakota.

Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of George L. Grobe, of New York, to be United States attorney for the western district of New York.

Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of John G. Utterback, of Maine, to be United States marshal for the district of Maine.

Mr. MILLER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Harry J. Lemley, of Arkansas, to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of Arkansas, to fill a position created by the act of Congress of May 31, 1938.

Mr. KING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the following nominations:

Simon Helienthal to be United States district judge, division No. 3, District of Alaska; and

Charles J. Clasby, of Alaska, to be United States attorney, division No. 2, District of Alaska.

Mr. LOGAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the following nominations:

Loomis E. Cranor to be United States marshal for the western district of Kentucky;

Eli H. Brown, 3d, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the western district of Kentucky, vice Bunk Gardner, resigned; and

John M. Moore, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

#### TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harcourt Alexander Morgan to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### POSTMASTER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Sarah Brown to be postmaster at Lorman, Miss.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the calendar.

#### THE JUDICIARY—HARRY J. LEMLEY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has favorably reported the nomination of Harry J. Lemley to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of Arkansas. I ask unanimous consent that his nomination be now confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination?

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### MINISTER TO CANADA—DANIEL C. ROPER

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations has favorably reported the nomination of Mr. Daniel C. Roper to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be now confirmed.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is the request for immediate consideration of the nomination of Mr. Roper to be Minister to Canada?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I have conferred with the majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. PITTMAN], and, under the circumstances, I have no objection to the present consideration of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. PITTMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

## RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 9, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

*Executive nominations received by the Senate May 8, 1939*

## TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Edward H. Foley, Jr., of New York, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury, to fill an existing vacancy.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

## TO BE COLONELS

Lt. Col. Kenneth Bailey Harmon, Ordnance Department, from May 1, 1939.

Lt. Col. Ernest Joseph Dawley, Field Artillery, from May 1, 1939.

Lt. Col. Herbert O'Leary, Ordnance Department, from May 1, 1939.

Lt. Col. Harry Dwight Chamberlin, Cavalry, from May 1, 1939.

## TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONELS

Maj. Sevier Rains Tupper, Infantry, from May 1, 1939.

Maj. Frank Royse, Field Artillery, from May 1, 1939.

Maj. Laurence Fielding Stone, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), from May 1, 1939.

Maj. Irving Carrington Avery, Infantry, from May 1, 1939.

## TO BE MAJORS

Capt. Francis Valentine FitzGerald, Quartermaster Corps, from May 1, 1939.

Capt. Charles Summers Miller, Cavalry, from May 1, 1939.

Capt. Thomas James Chrisman, Infantry, from May 1, 1939.

Capt. Benjamin Harrison Graban, Finance Department, from May 1, 1939.

Capt. Arthur Ross Nichols, Infantry, from May 1, 1939.

Capt. Bernice Musgrove McFadyen, Infantry, from May 1, 1939.

Capt. Logan Woods Boyd, Infantry, from May 1, 1939.

Capt. Ulysses Grant Jones, Air Corps (temporary major, Air Corps), from May 1, 1939.

Capt. George Stainback Deaderick, Quartermaster Corps, from May 1, 1939.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of July 1938:

George K. Weber

Harry W. vonHasseln

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of August 1938:

Robert R. Ferguson

Harold A. Turner

Harry J. Hansen

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of September 1938:

Rossmore D. Lyon

Thomas A. Gray

George L. Compo

Valentine H. Schaeffer

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Robert P. Briscoe, October 1, 1938.

Cuthbert A. Griffiths, November 24, 1938.

Morton T. Seligman, December 1, 1938.

William D. Sample, January 1, 1939.

Richard B. Tuggle, January 1, 1939.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the 13th day of February, 1939:

Ralph W. Hungerford

Charles B. Hunt

Robert L. Boiler

James J. Hughes

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the 13th day of February 1939:

Frederick R. Furth

Harold B. Miller

William B. Bailey

Henry C. Daniel

Sherman E. Burroughs, Jr.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Robert A. Theobald, Jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of May 1939.

Ensign Paul D. Ellis, Jr., to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 29th day of May 1937.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 4th day of June 1939:

Gould Hunter

Parker L. Folsom

Charles M. Holcombe

Lt. Comdr. Beverley R. Harrison, Jr., to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of July 1938, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named passed assistant paymasters to be paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the 13th day of February 1939:

Joseph E. Wolowsky

James B. Ricketts

Alfred P. Randolph

Machinist Charles F. Foster to be a chief machinist in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 18th day of March 1939.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 4th day of June 1939:

John H. Turner

Jud F. Yoho, Jr.

## APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of June 1939:

James L. Abbott, Jr.

Edward Ackerman

Dudley H. Adams

Henry P. Adams

Paul G. Adams, Jr.

William D. Adams

Howard P. Ady, Jr.

William T. Alford

Nelson J. Allen

Neal Almgren

Fernald P. Anderson

John B. Anderson

Marlin D. C. Apple

John L. Arrington, 2d

Nathan F. Asher

George M. K. Baker, Jr.

John B. Balch

Carl J. Ballinger, Jr.

William R. Ballou, Jr.

James R. Banks

Albert R. Barbee, Jr.

Robert C. Barnes

Richard F. Barry, Jr.

Daniel S. Baughman, Jr.

Edward L. Beach, Jr.

John G. Beard, Jr.

Clarence W. Becker

Clarence E. Bell, Jr.

Thomas H. Bell

Wendell W. Bemis

Herbert E. Benham

Rafael C. Benitez

Norman Bennett

Thomas M. Bennett

Winfred E. Berg

Max A. Berns, Jr.

James C. Bidwell

David S. Bill, Jr.

John R. Blackburn

Frank Blaha

Edward C. Blonts, Jr.

Sigmund A. Bobczynski

Emmett P. Bonner

William D. Bonvillian

Karl F. Border

Robert L. Border

Henry J. Brantingham

Roy E. Breen, Jr.

William W. Brehm

Jack E. Brenner

Robert Brent

Donald C. Brewington

Robert M. Brownlie

Jerome J. Bruckel

David G. Bryce

Russell H. Buckley

Fred M. Bush, Jr.

Sam J. Caldwell, Jr.

John V. Cameron

William J. Carey, Jr.

Earl E. Carlsen

Daniel J. Garrison

Hubert E. Carter

Charles M. Cassel, Jr.

Herbert A. Cassidy, Jr.

Joseph W. Castello

George B. Cattermole

John M. Cease



Charles R. Chandler  
 Kenan C. Childers, Jr.  
 Arthur B. Chilton, Jr.  
 Donald McR. Chisholm  
 Charles R. Clark, Jr.  
 Robert W. Clark  
 Fredric "B" Clarke  
 Jesse S. Claypoole, Jr.  
 James P. Coleman  
 Samuel L. Collins  
 Almer P. Colvin  
 Emmett M. Compton  
 Davis Cone  
 Robert W. Conrad  
 Franklin E. Cook, Jr.  
 Byron E. Cooke  
 Lemuel D. Cooke  
 Francis T. Cooper, Jr.  
 Frederic W. Corle  
 Frank J. Coulter  
 Earle F. Craig  
 Norton E. Croft  
 Partee W. Crouch, Jr.  
 John H. Crowe  
 Frank M. Culpepper  
 Charles W. Cushman  
 Robertson C. Dailey  
 Charles A. Dancy, Jr.  
 James A. Dare  
 Edward L. Dashiell, Jr.  
 Robert H. Dasteel  
 Harry E. Davey, Jr.  
 Edmonds David  
 Landon L. Davis, Jr.  
 Warren J. Davis, Jr.  
 William S. Dawson  
 Donald C. Deane  
 Robert F. Deibel, Jr.  
 Russell C. Dell  
 William R. DeLoach, Jr.  
 William Denton, Jr.  
 Vincent P. dePoix  
 Irving D. Dewey  
 Robert C. Dexter, Jr.  
 Paul A. Dimberg  
 John R. Dinsmore  
 John W. Dolan, Jr.  
 Norman W. Doudiet  
 Walter L. Douglas, Jr.  
 Richard L. Downing  
 Andrew R. Drea  
 Richard J. Dressling  
 John B. Dudley  
 George C. Duncan  
 James M. Dunford  
 Ernest H. Dunlap, Jr.  
 John E. Dunn  
 William R. Dunne  
 William R. Durrett  
 Robert J. Duryea  
 Thomas R. Eddy  
 James H. Elsom  
 John K. Estes  
 Robert C. Evins  
 Richard T. Fahy  
 Iler J. Fairchild, Jr.  
 Eugene G. Fairfax  
 Frederic C. Fallon  
 William B. Fargo  
 Harold E. Felix  
 Martinianeau Felix  
 John A. Fidel  
 Arthur M. Fields, Jr.  
 Chester H. Fink  
 Arthur F. Fischer, Jr.

Benhardt B. Fischer  
 Ellis J. Fisher  
 John C. Fisher  
 Francis J. Fitzpatrick  
 Edward J. Foote  
 George W. Forbes, Jr.  
 Blake S. Forrest  
 Murray B. Frazee, Jr.  
 Andrew J. Frosch  
 Donald Furlong  
 Saxe P. Gantz  
 Andrew J. Gardner  
 Tom J. Gary  
 Robert W. Gavin  
 Harold W. Gehman  
 Lawrence R. Geis  
 William W. Gentry  
 Calvin S. George, Jr.  
 Bernard J. Germershausen  
 George D. Ghesquiere  
 Edward I. Gibson  
 Paul W. Gill  
 Robert C. Gillette  
 Morris D. Gilmore, Jr.  
 James G. Glaes  
 Paul E. Glenn  
 Claude L. Goodman, Jr.  
 William F. Goodrum  
 Lee D. Goolsby  
 John M. Gore  
 George Gould  
 Richard K. Gould  
 Edward T. Grace  
 Edgar D. Grady  
 Selwyn H. Graham, Jr.  
 Robert R. Green  
 Howard J. Greene  
 Francis B. Grubb  
 John B. Guerrey, Jr.  
 Robert P. Guiler, 3d  
 Robert A. Gulick, Jr.  
 Robert L. Gurnee  
 Andrew B. Hamm  
 Jack D. Harby  
 Ira S. Hardman, Jr.  
 Donald J. Hardy  
 Neil E. Harkleroad  
 Joseph F. Harmon  
 John D. Harper, Jr.  
 Edwin L. Harris, Jr.  
 Leroy E. Harris  
 Noble C. Harris, Jr.  
 Arthur G. Harrison  
 Thomas C. Hart  
 Harry L. Harty, Jr.  
 William G. Hawthorne, Jr.  
 Eugene F. Hayward  
 Harry D. Helfrich, Jr.  
 Richard L. Helm  
 Charles N. G. Hendrix  
 Eugene B. Henry, Jr.  
 Wayne Herkness, 2d  
 Elmore F. Higgins, Jr.  
 Alfred H. Higgs  
 James McC. Hill  
 Stanley E. Hindman  
 James M. Hingson  
 John D. P. Hodapp, Jr.  
 Edmond A. Hoggard  
 Cleon J. Holden  
 Paul A. Holmberg  
 Charles Holovak  
 Edward R. Holt, Jr.  
 Valentine G. Holzapfel  
 Frederic A. Hooper

Posey A. Hooper  
 Jack W. Hough  
 Willard Y. Howell  
 John B. Howland  
 William W. Huffman  
 Joseph W. Hughes  
 Overton D. Hughlett  
 Warren L. Hunt  
 Wilbur H. Hunter, Jr.  
 William C. Hushing  
 Kenneth B. Hysong  
 Nathaniel W. James, 3d  
 Benjamin C. Jarvis  
 Richard P. Jeffrey  
 Charles W. Jenkins  
 Stephen L. Johnson  
 Dave Johnston, Jr.  
 James F. B. Johnston  
 Means Johnston, Jr.  
 John C. Jolly  
 Thomas D. Keegan  
 William J. Keim  
 Stanley W. Kerkering  
 Macgregor Kilpatrick  
 Loren H. Kiser  
 Fred W. Kittler  
 Raymond P. Kline  
 Eugene V. Knox  
 Frank H. Kolb, Jr.  
 Kenneth L. Kollmyer  
 Emil F. Korb  
 William G. Kornahrens  
 Charles J. Kovaleski  
 Paul T. Krez  
 Herbert Kriloff  
 William E. Kuntz  
 Chester J. Kurzawa  
 William R. Laird, Jr.  
 Robert V. Laney  
 Harold C. Lank  
 George J. Largess  
 Harvey L. Lasell  
 Clement T. Latimer  
 John C. Lawrence  
 Robert E. Lawrence  
 James J. LeClare  
 Charles F. Leigh  
 Orville O. Liebschner  
 Elbert C. Lindon  
 Joseph D. Linehan  
 Henry F. Lloyd  
 Richard W. Lombard  
 Paul E. Loustaunau  
 Lawrence Lovig, Jr.  
 Marcus L. Lowe, Jr.  
 James J. Madison  
 John W. Magee  
 Jack A. Mahony, Jr.  
 Samuel J. Major  
 William J. Manning  
 Lincoln Marcy  
 William B. Martin  
 Wilbur J. Mason  
 Robert L. Mastin  
 John C. Mathews  
 Edward D. Mattson  
 James L. May  
 James A. McAllister  
 Charles DeW. McCall  
 John C. McCarthy  
 James W. McConaughay  
 Montrose G. McCormick  
 Jesse W. McCoy  
 James W. McCrocklin  
 George T. McDaniel, Jr.

Richard S. McElroy, Jr.  
 Harry W. McElwain  
 Walter A. McGuinness  
 William E. McGuirk, Jr.  
 Corwin G. Mendenhall, Jr.  
 Robert G. Merritt  
 John J. A. Michel  
 Edward Micka  
 Charles K. Miller  
 Frank D. Miller  
 Harold C. Miller  
 Jim D. Miller  
 John F. Miller, Jr.  
 Stuart O. Miller  
 Walter B. Miller  
 John H. Millington  
 Drury K. Mitchell, Jr.  
 Floyd E. Moan  
 George E. Moore, 2d  
 Waller C. Moore, Jr.  
 Harvey S. Moredock, Jr.  
 John S. Moyer  
 Roman V. Mrozinski  
 John C. K. Muhlenberg  
 John J. Munson  
 Hubert T. Murphy  
 Thomas W. Murphy  
 Charles D. Nace  
 Albert G. Neal  
 Richard B. Neal  
 Dwight O. Ness  
 George "W" Netts  
 Rowland F. Nicolai  
 Gerald S. Norton  
 Marvin D. Norton, Jr.  
 Harvey R. Nylund  
 Reginald F. Ockley, Jr.  
 Edward Olcott  
 James C. Oldfield  
 Donald J. O'Meara  
 Denis E. O'Neil, Jr.  
 John T. T. O'Neill  
 Stephen C. O'Rourke  
 Rexford J. Ostrom  
 Allyn B. Ostroski  
 Robert E. Paige  
 Roger W. Paine, Jr.  
 George R. Palus  
 John E. Parks  
 Clyde H. Parmelee  
 Gaylord S. Parrett  
 DeWitt McD. Patterson  
 Oliver H. Payne  
 John C. Pennell  
 Reuben N. Perley, Jr.  
 Frank C. Perry  
 Carl F. Pfeifer  
 Richard W. Phillips  
 Canterbury B. Pierce  
 Chester F. Pinkerton  
 William L. Poindexter  
 David H. Pope  
 Lucien C. Powell, Jr.  
 Richard T. Pratt  
 Edward M. Price  
 John B. Pye  
 Ivan D. Quillin  
 John F. Quinn, Jr.  
 Frederick M. Radel  
 Robert Raleigh  
 Frank M. Ralston  
 James D. Ramage  
 Clay H. Raney  
 Ralph W. Rawson  
 Henry G. Reaves, Jr.

Edwin G. Reed, Jr.  
 Allen B. Register  
 Lenard O. Reichel  
 John M. Reigart  
 James D. Reilly  
 William M. Reindollar  
 Herbert D. Remington  
 John N. Renfro  
 Luther S. Reynolds  
 William M. Ringness  
 John B. Ritch, Jr.  
 Richard E. Robb  
 James McL. Robertson  
 Leslie S. Robinson  
 Richard W. Robinson  
 Louis H. Roddis, Jr.  
 George V. Rogers  
 Grant H. Rogers  
 Paul C. Rooney  
 Joseph C. Roper  
 Clayton Ross, Jr.  
 Eli B. Roth  
 Thomas J. Rudden, Jr.  
 William J. Ruhe  
 Augustus J. Rush  
 Frederick N. Russell  
 Edward F. Rye  
 John W. Salvage  
 Onofrio F. Salvia  
 Hugh B. Sanders, Jr.  
 William L. Savidge  
 William T. Sawyer  
 Paul R. Schratz  
 Ernest F. Schreiter  
 Roland W. Schumann, Jr.  
 Ernest L. Schwab, Jr.  
 George W. Scott, Jr.  
 William H. Seed  
 John P. Seifert  
 Edward H. Seiler, Jr.  
 Harry A. Seymour  
 Preston N. Shamer  
 George F. Sharp  
 John A. Sharpe, Jr.  
 John E. Shepherd, 3d  
 William M. Shifflette  
 Gene T. Shirley  
 Norman S. Short  
 Peter Shumway  
 Theodore C. Siegmund  
 George C. Simmons, Jr.  
 George S. Simmons, 3d  
 Eugene H. Simpson  
 Robert J. Slagle  
 Gustav A. Smeja  
 Chester W. Smith  
 George R. Smith  
 Gordon W. Smith  
 James H. Smith, Jr.  
 Robert H. Smith  
 William H. Snyder  
 Louis P. Spear  
 Herman Spector  
 John C. Spencer  
 John F. Splain  
 Charles R. Stapler  
 Will P. Starnes  
 Robert R. Startzell

Egil T. Steen  
 William V. Stevenson  
 Walter K. Stow, Jr.  
 John G. Street  
 Albert R. Strow  
 Robert R. Stuart, Jr.  
 Ronald F. Stultz  
 Tom S. Sutherland  
 Richard M. Swensson  
 Douglas N. Syverson  
 Frederick L. Tausch  
 Donald F. Taucher  
 Charles S. Thomas, Jr.  
 Howard A. Thompson  
 Ralph S. Thompson  
 William L. Thompson  
 Alfred J. Toulon, Jr.  
 Robert J. Trauger  
 Robert C. Truax  
 Frederick B. Tucker  
 Houston C. Tucker, Jr.  
 Richard McC. Tunnell  
 Marshall E. Turnbaugh  
 Theodore M. Ustick  
 Vadym V. Utgoff  
 William J. Valentine  
 Jacob J. Vandergrift, Jr.  
 Karl S. Van Meter  
 Frank W. Vannoy  
 Lloyd R. Vasey  
 Frederic Vieweg, Jr.  
 Curtis F. Vossler  
 Alexander S. Wadsworth, 3d  
 Robert F. Wadsworth  
 Alton L. C. Waldron  
 Thomas J. Walker, 3d  
 William J. Walker  
 Lester S. Wall, Jr.  
 Alfred B. Wallace  
 Daniel J. Wallace, Jr.  
 James B. Wallace  
 John R. Wallingford  
 Elmer S. Waring, Jr.  
 Rex W. Warner  
 David W. Watkins, Jr.  
 James G. Watson  
 John C. Weatherwax  
 Francis B. Weiler  
 John P. Weinell  
 Daniel K. Weitzenfeld  
 Francis M. Welch  
 Harold A. Wells  
 Joseph M. West  
 Norman W. White  
 Robert S. Whitman, Jr.  
 John B. Williams, Jr.  
 William H. Williams  
 Thomas C. Williamson  
 Wilbur S. Wills, Jr.  
 John V. Wilson  
 Gustave A. Wolf  
 Robert B. Wood  
 Wilson G. Wright, 3d  
 Allan G. Wussow  
 William K. Yarnall  
 Jack C. Young  
 Raphael A. Zoeller  
 John R. Zullinger

#### CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 8, 1939*

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Daniel C. Roper to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada.

#### TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Harcourt Alexander Morgan to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Harry J. Lemley to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of Arkansas.

#### APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

NOTE.—For the entire list of midshipmen this day nominated to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of June 1939, all of whom were today confirmed, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the caption "Appointments in the Navy."

#### POSTMASTER

#### MISSISSIPPI

Sarah Brown, Lorman.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 8, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

This is our Father's world; God reigns; let the earth be glad. O God, we look toward Thee as men look for the morning. Thou art our Sun; Thou art our Light; Thou art our Life; let us feel the heavenly touches of our blessed Saviour. No longer is there need for us to turn toward Jerusalem; our offering and our sacrifice are here. We pray Thee to clothe us with the garments of good will and poise; may we resolve to allow no man to degrade our souls by making us hate; remind us that the remedy against it is love. God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, unto whom be eternal praises world without end. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 5, was read and approved.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered at the University of Richmond last Friday by my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DARDEN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Nassau Daily Review.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief statement by the agricultural director of extension in Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, today marks the silver jubilee of a great agricultural event. Twenty-five years ago today, May 8, 1914, Congress passed the Smith-Lever bill. In a speech here in the House of Representatives, June 1, 1920, and in which reference was made to agricultural legislation